DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 303 EA 005 409

TITLE	Illinois School Problems. A Report.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State School Problems Commission, Springfield.
SPONS AGENCY	Illinois State General Assembly, Springfield.
REPORT NO	SPC-R-12
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	64p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Collective Negotiation; Educational Administration; *Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Problems; Equalization Aid; Financial Problems; Full State Funding; School Taxes; State Aid; *State Legislation
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

This document contains a summary of the recommendations made in 1972 and 1973 by the Commission to the Illinois Legislature. Areas covered in the proposed educational legislation and in the recommendations include the common school fund, adult education, the gifted program, special education, the bilingual program, urban education, pupil transportation, the parental school, the breakfast and lunch program, a full-year incentive program, continuing boards where charters are abandoned, a State school board, subdivision of land for school purposes, educational assessment, financial planning, adjustment of tax levies, and a program of research on district organization. The findings of the commission, task forces, and committees on methods of funding the common schools are summarized. These summaries give special attention to the equalizing and weighting formulas developed by the research groups. The document concludes with a proposed negotiation bill for resolving conflicts in the education community. Numerous tables in the appendixes compare expenditures among various districts in Illinois and present time series data on the changing pattern of State aid to the school districts. (Author/DN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082303

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ILLINOIS SCHOOL PROBLEMS

Report of the School Problems Commission No. 12

1973

EA 005 409

STATE OF ILLINOIS
SCHOOL PROBLEMS COMMISSION

Report No. 12

Illinois School Problems

1973

School Problems Commission Membership

Senators

John G. Gilbert, Carbondale
(Replaced by Harris W. Fawell, Naperville)

E. B. Groen, Pekin
(Replaced by Dr. David C. Shapiro, Amboy)

Kenneth Hall, East St. Louis

Thomas C. Hynes, Chicago

Esther Saperstein, Chicago

Representatives

Arthur L. Berman, Chicago

Charles W. Clabaugh, Champaign

Gene L. Hoffman, Elmhurst

Elmo L. McClain, Quincy
(Replaced by Robert E. Brinkmeier, Forreston)

Carl W. Soderstrom, Streator

Appointed by the Governor

Velma B. Crain

Donald D'Amico

Carol Kimmel

John A. Koten

George T. Wilkins

John W. McCarter, Director of Finance
(Replaced by Harold Hovey in January 1973)

Michael Bakalis, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Chairman . . . . . Gene L. Hoffman, Elmhurst

Vice-Chairman. . . . . John G. Gilbert, Carbondale

Secretary. . . . . Carol Kimmel, Evanston

Research Director. . . . . Ben C. Hubbard, Bloomington

Legal Consultant . . . . . Kenneth Lemmer, Havana

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Authority for the Commission to Study Schools		vi
Letter of Transmittal		ix
Foreword		x
CHAPTER I.	RECOMMENDATIONS OF SCHOOL PROBLEMS COMMISSION NUMBER 12	1
1.	Common School Fund and Other Educational Appropriations	1
2.	Transportation	2
3.	Continuing Boards Where Charters Are Abandoned	3
4.	Bonds for Fire Safety and Prevention Work	3
5.	Year-Round School Study	4
6.	A State School Board	4
7.	Organization of Dual Districts	7
8.	Financial Planning for Present and Future	8
9.	Educational Assessment	8
10.	Subdivision Land for School Purposes	8
11.	Adjustment of Tax Levy	9
12.	Common School Fund--Distributive Fund	9
CHAPTER II.	A SUMMARY OF MAJOR STUDY COMMISSION, TASK FORCES AND COMMITTEES ON METHODS OF FUNDING THE COMMON SCHOOLS	13
	The Finance Task Force of the Governor's Commission on Schools, 1972.	13
	Final Report of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on School Finance	16
	The Business Management Task Force of the Governor's Commission on Schools	18
	The House Financing of Education Study Committee	20

CHAPTER III. A PROPOSED NEGOTIATION BILL WITH THE RATIONALE FOR MAJOR POSITIONS 21

APPENDIX A. STATE AID CLAIMS: 1940-1973. 29

APPENDIX B. ILLINOIS SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY COUNTIES 30

APPENDIX C. SELECTED BIENNIAL STATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES, 1911-1973, WITH TOTAL COST COMPARISONS. 34

APPENDIX D. SCHOOL STATISTICS BY COUNTIES 35

APPENDIX E. SCHOOL STATISTICS BY COUNTIES 1970-1971, INCOME BY COUNTY FROM STATE AND FEDERAL SOURCES. 37

APPENDIX F. PUBLIC SCHOOL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ACT 39

APPENDIX G. HISTORY OF THE BASIS OF THE GENERAL STATE AID FORMULA FOR THE PAST 45 YEARS 52

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMISSION TO STUDY SCHOOLS

An Act to create a commission to survey and study the problems pertaining to the public schools in the State, to define its powers and duties, and to make an appropriation therefor. (Approved July 8, 1957.)

Creation. Sec. 1. There is created a commission consisting of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Director of Finance, 5 members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore, 5 members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker thereof and 5 members to be appointed by the Governor. Such appointment shall be in writing and filed with the Secretary of State as public record. The members shall receive only actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. Vacancies occurring in the appointive membership of the commission shall be filled by the original appointing authority from the group in which the vacancy occurred. The commission shall organize by selecting from its membership a chairman and may employ a secretary and other necessary employees.

Appointments--Tenure. Sec. 2. The members of the commission shall be appointed during the month of June and shall serve for terms of 2 years beginning July 1, of each odd numbered year and members so appointed shall continue to serve until their respective successors are appointed, except that General Assembly members shall serve such term or until termination of their legislative service, whichever first occurs. (Amended by Act approved June 25, 1963.)

Special Study Groups. Sec. 3. The commission may appoint members of the Legislature or otherwise to act as special study groups to operate under the direction of the commission and such appointed members shall receive only actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

Duties of Commission--Recommendations. Sec. 4. The commission shall study:

(1) The progress and problems of school district reorganization and the means of further promotion of an efficient school system.

(2) Need of further codification and revision of the school laws.

(3) State, county and local school administration of the common schools and the interrelationship of such administration.

(4) The adequacy and efficiency of present plans of granting State common school aids of the various types, including the State aid formula and qualifying rates.

(5) The methods of acquiring adequate revenue for schools and the definite sources of possible revenue for local school funds and for state school aids.

(6) Any problems which may arise that may affect the general welfare of the schools.

The commission shall also counsel and advise with the Superintendent of Public Instruction on any school problem that he may bring to them for consideration. The commission may from time to time make recommendations for consideration of improvement in any public school area.

The commission shall also make recommendations to the Budgetary Commission prior to February 1 of each odd numbered year as to the amount of the State school aids required for the succeeding biennium.

Study Urban School Districts. Sec. 4.1. The commission shall select a sub-committee and provide it with an adequate staff to study the specific needs of urban school districts in Illinois, suggest methods of meeting such needs, and the role of the State in relation thereto. The report of such sub-committee shall be included in the report of the commission to the General Assembly. (Added by L. 1967, H.B. 1924, approved September 8, 1967.) (Section 2. Appropriation $10,000.)*

Additional Duties. Sec. 5. The commission shall consider and study all germane factors in an effort to determine the improvements necessary to raise the educational standards of the public schools to a desirable level.

---

*This duty was completed in 1969 when the sub-committee presented its report and the commission recommended the passage of a number of implementary acts.

Employees--Compensation--Secretarial and Stenographic Assistance. Sec. 6. The commission shall employ and fix the compensation of such employees and technical assistants versed in the aims and problems of public education as it deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall furnish such secretarial and stenographic assistance to the commission as the commission requests.

Reports. Sec. 7. The commission shall make a detailed report of its findings and conclusion to the General Assembly not later than March 1 of each odd numbered year and shall submit recommendations for such legislation as it deems necessary.

(Appropriation. Sec. 8.)

(Note: Chapter 122, Sections 755-761, inclusive, Illinois Revised Statutes, 1969.)

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

TO: Governor Daniel Walker
and the Members of the Seventy-Eighth General Assembly
Springfield, Illinois

The Illinois School Problems Commission Number 12 wishes to submit this complete report.

This is the final report of the recommendations of the Commission, together with informative data and a digest of currently important material necessary to understand fully the basis of many of the recommendations made herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Gene L. Hoffman, Chairman
Carol Kimmel, Secretary
Michael Bakalis
Arthur L. Berman
Robert E. Brinkmeier
Charles W. Clabaugh
Velma B. Crain
Donald D'Amico
Harris W. Fawell
Kenneth Hall
Harold Hovey
Thomas C. Hynes
John A. Koten
Esther Saperstein
Dr. David C. Shapiro
Carl W. Soderstrom
George T. Wilkins

FOREWORD

The Illinois School Problems Commission, a continuing commission since 1957, has designated this report as Report Number 12 in keeping with the established practice of numbering reports consecutively in each biennium. Despite the fact that this Commission did furnish its recommendations in many forms to the General Assembly for the sessions in 1972, it did not file a complete report. A summary of those recommendations made in 1972 as well as those made for the 1973 session are included in this volume. The Commission has referred to itself as School Problems Commission Number 12 throughout both the 1972 and 1973 sessions of the General Assembly.

Membership: Since the conclusion of the work of the 11th School Problems Commission, there have been a number of changes in membership.

Representative Charles W. Clabaugh stepped aside as chairman but continued to serve as a member of the Commission.

Senator John Gilbert served as vice-chairman until his term in the Senate ended in January of 1973. Senator Gilbert had served on Commissions Number 9, 10, and 11. He has been a strong supporter of the legislation proposed to improve the schools of Illinois and had handled much of the legislation proposed by the Commission in the Senate. His work on the Commission and in the Senate have contributed much to the success of legislation proposed by the Commission.

Senator E. B. Groen had served on the Commission since the 4th Commission. He has been a distinguished member of the Commission, serving longer than any other senator in the history of the Commission. His wise counsel and dedicated work will be missed.

Senator Everett E. Laughlin, although he continued to serve in the Senate, was not reappointed to the Commission. He served only one biennium as a member of the Commission.

Mr. John W. McCarter, Jr., Director of Finance, had served on the Commission for four years prior to being replaced in January of 1973. He was a regular

attender of meetings and had contributed much to the deliberations of the Commission.

Representative Elmo L. McClain of Quincy had been a member of the 10th, 11th and 12th Commissions prior to his death while serving during the 1972 session of the General Assembly. His service to the Commission had been outstanding. His skill in handling legislation, in pointing out the needs of education and in working with members of the General Assembly from both sides of the aisle marked him as an outstanding legislator and a distinguished member of the School Problems Commission. His devoted service, his wise counsel and his warm and friendly personality all contributed to making him one of the most respected members of the Commission. He will be missed by all who knew him, but especially by those who served on the Commission with him.

Senator Kenneth Hall of East St. Louis was appointed to the Commission to replace Senator Everett E. Laughlin at the beginning of the biennium.

The members of the Commission appointed in 1973 to complete the terms of the above persons are:

Mr. Harold Hovey, Director, Bureau of the Budget
Senator Harris W. Fawell
Senator David C. Shapiro
Representative Robert E. Brinkmeier

Representative Gene L. Hoffman was elected as chairman of the Commission, Senator John Gilbert as vice-chairman and Mrs. Carol Kimmel as secretary.

In addition to the changes in membership described above, the members who continued to serve are:

Senator Thomas C. Hynes, Chicago
Senator Kenneth Hall, East St. Louis
Senator Esther Saperstein, Chicago
Representative Arthur L. Berman, Chicago
Representative Charles W. Clabaugh, Champaign
Representative Carl W. Soderstrom, Streator
Representative Gene L. Hoffman, Elmhurst

Mrs. Velma B. Crain, Springfield
Dr. Donald D'Amico, Joliet
Mrs. Carol Kimmel, Rock Island
Mr. John A. Koten
Mr. George T. Wilkins, Granite City
Dr. Michael Bakalis, Springfield

The Staff: The staff has remained the same with Kenneth Lemmer serving as the legal council, Ben C. Hubbard as research director, and Mrs. Mildred Kittell as secretary in the office of the Commission.

Procedure: All School Problems Commissions have held hearings throughout the biennium and then reported to the General Assembly when it convened. The annual sessions and special sessions in 1972 have made this less easy to accomplish. However, the Commission has met monthly to listen to all who are concerned about school problems and has held special hearings in different parts of the state: at Normal, Ottawa, Chicago, Collinsville, Mt. Vernon, Niles, and Libertyville. The regular meetings have been held in Springfield and in Chicago.

The hearings have resulted in many persons expressing their feelings about education. In nearly all cases persons appearing have furnished the Commission copies of their presentations and these are on file in the Commission office at 217 South First Street in Springfield. In addition, summaries of the proposals that have been brought before the Commission have been prepared in working papers for the members and copies of these summaries are available in the office.

Recommendations of the Commission have been furnished to the members of the General Assembly in the form of Commission-sponsored bills at each of the sessions during the life of the 12th Commission. Recommendations of the Commission are included in Chapter 1 of this report.

Acknowledgments: Many individuals, groups and organizations have been helpful in explaining the problems of education to the Commission and cannot be recognized individually. Every presentation has been studied, discussed and a decision made about whether or not to sponsor legislation resulting from the

recommendation. Without naming these persons, the Commission members are grateful to each person who has helped them to understand the problems faced by education in Illinois.

The personnel in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction have been most cooperative and helpful. Special recognition should be given to Dr. Fred Bradshaw and Mr. Robert Pyle for their extension of formula and financial data, to Mr. Donald Eslick for his continuous help with bills and statutes and to Dr. James Howard for preparing the tables which appear as the appendices of this report. Dr. Bakalis has been very helpful and has been supportive of the efforts of these and other staff persons who have assisted in many ways. For the time spent and willingness to help in any way possible, the Commission is grateful to Dr. Bakalis and his staff. Dr. Redmond, the Chicago Board of Education and the staff have assisted the Commission in every way possible when meetings were scheduled in Chicago. For the time spent and help rendered, the Commission is grateful.

A special thanks is extended by the Commission to the Board of Regents, the President, the Dean of the University and the Dean of the College of Education at Illinois State University who have made it possible for the Director of Research to adjust his work so as to be able to serve the School Problems Commission.

Two persons, graduate students at Illinois State University, prepared Chapter III of this report at the request of the Director of Research. The chapter is a condensation of work done separately by each of them and then condensed for this report. The students were Representative Gene L. Hoffman, Chairman of the Commission, and Mr. Walter Bishop, County Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Illinois.

CHAPTER I

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SCHOOL PROBLEMS COMMISSION NUMBER 12

Because of a number of sessions after the first regular session during which the 11th Commission reported, School Problems Commission Number 12 continued to bring recommendations to the 77th General Assembly throughout the biennium. Each of the recommendations made by the Commission during the 77th biennium was brought in the form of a bill. Listed below is a summary of those bills and following that summary is a listing of recommendations made by the Commission for the 78th General Assembly.

ACTION RECOMMENDED BY THE 12TH COMMISSION TO THE 77TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. Common School Fund and Other Educational Appropriations: In 1972 much time was spent on the question of state aid to school districts. Specifically, the Commission recommended that the state aid formula be changed to reduce the qualifying rate to .84 for high school districts having 500 or more WADA students and for elementary districts having 1,000 or more WADA students and that the percentage add-on be changed from 12% to 19%.

The size factor for elementary and high school districts passed both houses but other changes made it necessary to have a conference committee. The conference committee left the $.84 in but reduced the size to qualify to 100 for both types of districts, but no change was made in the 19% add-on recommended. In addition the bonus for size was changed for districts in excess of 200,000 pupils from 14% to 16% by amendment.

House Bill 4465 provided for the above changes.

In addition to the general formula changes recommended by the Commission, it was discovered that some districts which were required by law to spend money allocated by the size bonus would lose enough WADA population to make their claim fit a size smaller category than they had spent funds based upon. (Specifically, one district which had based its programs on a 20,000 or above bonus would have dropped back to the 10,000 to 20,000 size bracket, and one district in the 10,000

to 20,000 bracket would have dropped below 10,000.) Because the law had forced them to spend the funds, the Commission recommended that the statutes be changed to provide for no repayment because of this loss of funds for a single year. H.B. 4465 provided for this as well as the other changes.

In addition to making recommendations for the common school fund including teacher retirement, the Commission worked out recommended appropriations for other major educational programs, but by agreement left the preparation of bills for these appropriations to the OSPI. All of the financial amounts agreed to were designed to increase funding to the common schools for all purposes by $90,000,000.

The areas covered in the recommendations included the common school fund, adult education, the gifted program, special education, the bilingual program, urban education, pupil transportation, the parental school, the breakfast and lunch program, a full-year incentive program, and a program of research on district organization. The amounts to be included for each of the above items were agree to and the Commission endorsed the amounts to be appropriated.

2. Transportation: In addition to the base appropriation included in #1 above, the Commission had discovered many developing problems in operating transportation as a completely separate fund.

A number of districts had not been able to raise the funds necessary to pay 20% of the allowable cost of transportation with a 12¢ tax rate which was the maximum without a referendum, let alone pay the 20% with the qualifying rate of 3¢, 5¢, or 7¢. This was forcing these districts to go further and further into debt with each passing year.

The Commission recommended that the 80% maximum be changed so that any district which levied 12¢ for transportation would not have the 80% maximum applied. Any district that the 80% would limit but which did not levy the full 12¢ was recommended to be penalized proportionately to the amount they failed to levy the 12¢. The Commission also recommended that the appropriation to districts which had been penalized by the 80% provision be retroactive for three years, the life of the formula.

The General Assembly enacted these provisions in H.B. 4466.

Bonds to Retire Transportation Debts: A number of districts have accumulated deficits in the transportation fund for a variety of reasons including the problem mentioned above, transporting pupils not reimbursable, court ordered busing, activity busing (field trips, athletic events, etc.), purchasing equipment, deficits because they did not change their levy early enough with the new bill, and in many cases because the district did not make a deficit transfer from the education fund before the deadline the first year the transportation formula was operating. In many districts this accumulated deficit cannot be wiped out with the 12¢ levy.

To allow districts to solve this problem, H.B. 4467 was introduced.

The Commission recommended that Section 19-8 of the School Code, which provides for issuing bonds to pay for operational indebtedness in the education and building funds, be amended to allow this for the transportation fund.

This bill was not enacted and the serious problem of unresolved deficits still remains for many districts.

3. Continuing Boards Where Charters Are Abandoned: Several reports were received by the Commission that one argument for charter districts not voting to abandon their charters and become regular districts was the fear of having a completely new board in a single year.

The Commission recommended that the statutes be changed so that when a charter was abandoned the board membership would be continuous and would be replaced or continue in office by regular election procedure.

H.B. 4469 provided for this. After the General Assembly concurred with an amendatory veto, the bill was passed.

4. Bonds for Fire Safety and Prevention Work: The General Assembly had enacted legislation at the recommendation of the School Problems Commission to allow the

issuance of bonds against the tax authorized for fire safety and prevention work to allow a district to do the needed work quickly and then pay through time. In operation it was discovered that certain technical problems existed.

To correct these problems the Commission introduced H.B. 4261 and recommended its passage.

The General Assembly passed the bill and it became law.

5. Year-Round School Study: The Superintendent of Public Instruction proposed that an appropriation of $150,000 be made to pay for studies where districts were interested in studying the feasibility of converting one or more schools to a year-round school concept.

The Commission recommended that such a plan to assist local districts be enacted. H.B. 4264 was introduced and passed to carry out this plan.

The Commission continued to meet between sessions and into the Spring Session 1973. The following proposals and recommendations have been agreed to by the Commission members.

6. A State School Board: The Commission has worked to develop a workable bill to create a State School Board in keeping with the mandate of the Constitution. Throughout this biennium the Commission members have listened to all interested parties and have studied the report of the Committee on School Governance of the Governors Commission on Schools and other studies performed both in Illinois and nationally. These reports and opinions have been analyzed on each substantive point needed in a bill.

After many hours of discussion the Commission has agreed to recommend the following bill. The fact that there must be a working board in time to plan for the orderly transition from the present system to the constitutionally prescribed plan makes it imperative that a board be created in 1973. The following bill seems to be the best working plan that the Commission can develop.

AN ACT to add Article 1A to "The School Code" approved March 18, 1961, as amended.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly:

Section 1. Article 1A is added to "The School Code" approved March 18, 1961, as amended, the added Article to read as follows:

ARTICLE 1A

(Ch. 122, new par. 1A-1)

Sec. 1A-1. Members and terms. On or before January 1, 1974 the members of the State Board of Education shall be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The State Board of Education shall consist of 17 members appointed from a pattern of regional representation which is defined as an area identical with each of the 5 judicial districts as established by the State of Illinois. Eight appointees shall be selected from the First Judicial District and 2 appointees shall be selected from each of the 4 other judicial districts and one member shall be selected as a member-at-large. At no time may more than 9 members of the Board be from one political party. Party membership is defined as having voted in the primary of the party in the last primary before appointment preceding the previous general election. The 8 members initially appointed from the First Judicial District shall draw lots to determine which 2 shall serve 6-year terms, which 3 shall serve 4-year terms and which 3 shall serve 2-year terms. The members initially appointed from judicial districts 2 through 5 shall draw lots to determine which member from each district shall serve 6-year terms and the remaining members from districts 2 through 5 shall draw lots so that 2 serve 4-year terms and 2 serve 2-year terms. The member-at-large shall serve a 4-year term the first time appointed. Vacancies in terms shall be filled by appointment by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate for the extent of the unexpired term.

After the original terms, all terms shall be for 6 years.

(Ch. 122, new par. 1A-2)

Sec. 1A-2. Qualifications. The members of the State Board of Education shall be citizens of the United States and residents of the State of Illinois and shall be selected as far as may be practicable on the basis of their knowledge of, or interest and experience in, problems of public education. No member of the State Board of Education shall be gainfully employed or administratively connected with any school system or institution of higher learning, public or private, nor shall they be members of a school board or board of school trustees of a public or non-public school, college, university or technical institution. No member shall be appointed to more than 2 six-year terms. Members shall be reimbursed for all ordinary and necessary expenses incurred in performing their duties as members of the Board. Expenses shall be approved by the Board and be consistent with the laws, policies, and requirements of the State of Illinois

regarding such expenditures, plus any member may include in his claim for expenses a $50 per day per diem for meeting days.

(Ch. 122, new par. 1A-3)

Sec. 1A-3. Powers and Duties. The State Board of Education shall assume full powers and duties after initial appointment upon the expiration of the term of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction elected in 1970. During the period from initial appointment to the assumption of full duties and authority, the State Board of Education shall function in an advisory capacity to and with the current constitutionally established office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction. During this period they shall be given full access to all such information, records and staff as shall be reasonably necessary for understanding and planning their work when they shall assume full function as specified above. They shall, during this period, take necessary and appropriate action to interview and plan for appointment of a chief executive officer to be designated as State Superintendent of Education at the end of the term of the Superintendent of Public Instruction elected in 1970. If a vacancy occurs in the office prior to January 13, 1975, the Board shall appoint a successor.

(Ch. 122, new par. 1A-4)

Sec. 1A-4. Further Powers and Duties of the Board.

A. The Board shall select a chairman from its membership. He shall serve as chairman for 2 years.

B. The Board shall determine the qualifications of and appoint a chief education officer to be known as the State Superintendent of Education who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board except that no contract issued for the employment of the State Superintendent of Education shall be for a term longer than 3 years. The State Superintendent of Education shall not serve as a member of the State Board of Education. The Board shall set the compensation of the chief school officer and establish his duties, powers and responsibilities.

C. The duties of the State Board of Education shall encompass all duties currently delegated to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and such other duties as the General Assembly shall designate. The Board shall be responsible for the educational policies and guidelines for public and private schools, pre-school through grade 12 and Vocational Education in the State of Illinois. The Board shall analyze the present and future aims, needs, and requirements of education in the State of Illinois and recommend to the General Assembly the powers which should be exercised by the Board. The Board shall recommend the passage and the legislation necessary to determine the appropriate relationship between the Board and local boards of education and the various State agencies and shall recommend desirable modifications in the laws which affect schools.

D. Three members of the Board shall be appointed by the chairman to serve on a standing joint Education Committee and 3 others shall be ap-

pointed from the Board of Higher Education. The Committee will be responsible for developing policy on matters of mutual concern to both elementary, secondary and higher education such as Occupational and Career Education, Teacher Preparation and Certification, Educational Finance, Articulation between Elementary, Secondary and Higher Education and Research and Planning. The joint Educational Committee shall be required to meet at least quarterly and to annually report to both the State Board of Education, the State Board of Higher Education and to the General Assembly. All meetings of this Committee shall be official meetings for reimbursement under this Act.

E. Nine members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. A majority vote of a quorum is required to approve any action or to transact business.

The Board shall prepare and submit to the General Assembly and the Governor within one year of the date of assuming full duties and annually thereafter a report or reports of its findings and of its recommendations. A regular system of communication with other directly related State agencies shall be implemented.

We recommend the enactment of H.B. 661.

7. Organization of Dual Districts: The Eleventh School Problems Commission recommended the following:

Organization of Dual Districts: For a number of years the Commission has developed the concept that properly organized school districts improved the possibility of students receiving a good education. In the 9th School Problems Commission Report, the Commission endorsed the organization of a department of reorganization in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. That department has recommended, and the problems which the Commission has had presented to it convinces the members, that the making of elementary and secondary districts coterminous would be a great help. We believe that articulation, coordination of programs and general cooperation would result from elementary districts completely underlying a single high school. This would take some time.

We continue to recommend that statutes be enacted to require that no elementary district may lie in more than one high school district.

The bill, H.B. 1967, did not receive serious consideration. The Commission has again reviewed this matter and believes that there is real merit in having each elementary district totally within or coterminous with a high school district.

We, therefore, recommend that statutes be enacted to require that no elementary district have territory in more than one high school district.

8. Financial Planning for Present and Future: At present all data gathered on the financial operation of the schools is historical in nature. When transactions are completed and the funds are expended then data for the complete year is gathered. In order to gather information about needs in advance so that the General Assembly, the Governor and other vitally interested parties can plan for adequate funding, the Superintendent has asked for permission to gather the needed data and to require schools to submit the needed information. Years of attempting to get current data that could not be received until a year later have convinced the members of the Commission of the need for such reports.

We, therefore, support the concept of a financial planning bill and recommend its enactment.

9. Educational Assessment: The Superintendent of Public Instruction has proposed a program designed to begin gathering data so that educational achievement or lack of it can be more clearly assessed. There is a national move to find ways to tell the public how good or weak their schools are. This bill will be a beginning to help with this problem in Illinois. The recent report of the Governors Task Force, A New Design: Financing Education in Illinois, discusses this problem in considerable detail and recommends that a program of Educational Assessment and Evaluation be undertaken. The proposal of the Superintendent of Public Instruction is considerably less ambitious than the one proposed by the Task Force, but seems to represent a necessary first step. The Commission believes that a genuine assessment of educational needs is necessary for adequate future planning of programs and expenditures. A knowledge of what is effective or has been in also needed.

We, therefore, recommend that the plan of Educational Assessment proposed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction be enacted.

10. Subdivision Land for School Purposes: At almost every hearing held by the Commission in rapidly growing areas of the state for the past several years persons have asked for help with the problem of guaranteeing that land will be available for building schools in large subdivisions. The problem is particularly accute when a subdivision is built, prices skyrocket, and then school sites must

be found. As a part of a package to help with this problem, two bills have been introduced by Senator Fawell. These two bills make it permissible for muncipalities or county boards to, as a condition of approval of subdivision plats, require subdividers to dedicate land for school and park purposes or to make cash payments in lieu of such dedication. The Commission has examined S.B. 223 and 224 and finds that they adequately address this problem.

We, therefore, recommend that these bills, S.B. 223 and 224, be enacted to guarantee to municipalities and county boards who wish to the power to cope with the land acquisition problem.

11. Adjustment of Tax Levy: There have been problems for school districts when multipliers are changed drastically after tax levies have been made. When the multiplier is assigned after it is too late for the district to change its levy but in time for the increased assessment to count when computing state aid it results in the local taxes remaining at the same dollar level and state aid being reduced. If boards of education could adjust their levy after the multiplier was levied they could by keeping the same rate get the additional money which would be lost by a reduction in state aid.

We, therefore, recommend that the statutes be changed so that in the future a school board may amend its tax levy within ten days of being notified of the current equalized assessed valuation of the district on which taxes will be extended.

12. Common School Fund--Distributive Fund: Because no changes in the basic policy for the prior claims other than teacher retirement were to be recommended, the Commission made no recommendations relating to prior claims in the Common School Fund. The recommended budget amounts in the Superintendent of Public Instruction budget were adequate for the purpose of making appropriations. The Commission is continuing to follow the problems related to teacher retirement and may make specific recommendations about this matter before the session ends.

The distributive fund has occupied much of the time of the Commission. A Formula Sub-Committee served during the 77th General Assembly and reviewed many proposals. At the direction of this Sub-Committee the research director developed a resource equalization formula with assistance from Dr. G. Alan Hickrod of the Department of Educational Administration at Illinois State University. The formula was developed, simulated and reworked numerous times until at the beginning of the 78th General Assembly it had been included as a possible formula in both the Finance Task Force of The Governor's Commission on Schools and the Final Report of The Superintendent's Advisory Committee on School Finance. The Commission worked with the basic concepts of the Resource Equalizer and with modification of the formula recommended in the two volumes listed above and decided to recommend this approach to a new formula.

The basic principles and features which the recommendation included are as follows:

1. The state would support either the current formula or the new formula whichever was to the district's advantage.

2. The WADA would be counted as it is at present with an additional weighting of .375 per Title I student adjusted so that the district with the same proportion of Title I students as the state would get a weighting of .375 per Title I student. Districts with a lower ratio would get proportionately less and districts with greater concentration would get proportionately more but no student would be weighted more than .75.

3. The state would guarantee each unit district an assessment base of $42,000 per weighted pupil, each elementary district a base of $64,615 per WADA pupil, and each high school district a base of $120,000 per WADA pupil for operational purposes.

4. Operational taxes would be defined as all school taxes collected by a district except those for the Transportation Fund, the Rent Fund, and the Bond and Interest Fund.

5. A district would calculate its entitlement under the formula by subtracting its assessment per WADA pupils from the amounts shown in 3 above and multiplying the remainder by the tax rate collected in the district for operational purposes described in 4 above up to the maximum rates defined in 6 below.

6. The state would allow districts to participate up to a maximum tax rate of 3% in 12 grade districts, 1.95% in elementary districts, and 1.05% in secondary districts.

7. Local districts would effectively set their level of expenditure when they set their tax rates since all would be guaranteed the same reward for the same relative effort except for those districts having assessments greater than those levels set in 3 above.

8. The students in each district of the state would be treated equally regardless of the type district in which they lived. There would be no penalty because of the type of organization of the district.

9. Districts having taxing power greater than that outlined in 6 above would be required to reduce their levy in the year following the payment of additional funds by the state. The exception to this rollback would be where the people voted by referendum to allow a 15% increase for enrichment and experimentation or where the people had already voted additional taxes the board could by resolution keep such taxes subject to a backdoor referendum.

Since the installation of the above concepts would cost more additional money than could be provided in a single year, it is recommended that the formula be enacted by paying ¼ of the increase a district was entitled to each year. In addition, in an attempt to provide a plan that would furnish new money in a way that it could be used wisely and at the same time in an attempt to be responsible in the allocation of funds, it seemed feasible to limit the increase of a district to 25% more than the amount it received during the previous year. The phasing-in over a period of time seemed to the Commission to be the only way to accomplish the change from the present formula to a more equitable system within the possible resource of the state.

Having studied many suggested approaches to a new formula, the Commission decided that the above approach was the system which they believed best satisfied the needs of Illinois.

We therefore recommend that a Resource Equalizer formula including the above described principles be enacted over a four-year span of time.

CHAPTER II

A SUMMARY OF MAJOR STUDY COMMISSION, TASK FORCES AND COMMITTEES ON METHODS OF FUNDING THE COMMON SCHOOLS

During 1972 and 1973, as a result of the Serrano and Rodriquiz cases and a general feeling that the present state aid formula was inadequate, Illinois has had an unprecedented amount of study of the methods used in funding the schools. In 1969 in the 19th School Problems Commission Report this Commission discussed in some detail the basic systems that had been used or proposed nationally for distributing funds to schools. Continuously since that date there has been a Formula Committee of this Commission examining, preparing, and studying the effect of each formula upon the schools. Much of the time of the staff of the Commission has been consumed in developing first a percentage equalization approach to funding Illinois schools and in recent months a Resource Equalizer.

The Commission decided in mid-1972 to await the results of a number of study groups before making any final recommendation concerning adjustment or replacement of the current formula. The group reports which the Commission has studied most closely include the Finance Task Force of the Governor's Commission on Schools, the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on School Finance, the Business Management Task Force of the Governor's Commission on Schools, and because of common membership the House Financing of Education Study Committee. Copies of the reports and proposals of the first three groups are currently available but for the purpose of comparing them, the following summaries are included. The House Financing of Education Study Committee has not prepared a formal report but has worked with the other reports and developed some recommendations.

The Finance Task Force of the Governor's Commission on Schools, 1972

Despite the fact that there are many dissents to sections of the report, it is remarkable to find such a varied group of people who reached a consensus on so many crucial issues that relate to education in general and finance in particular. The reader should read the report for details of proposals on any item. This summary is, however, designed to describe only those parts of the report that deal with funding the common schools.

In the section on Resources, the Task Force suggested as a goal for the next several years that the following revenues be made available to increase the funding for elementary and secondary education.

1. 50% of the annual increase in state tax revenues.
2. 67% of the state's share of federal revenue.
3. 100% of the increase in state income tax revenue sharing to counties and municipalities. This would require freezing the dollar amounts that go to counties and municipalities at the fiscal year (FY) 1973 level. This was suggested because of the enormous additional revenues for municipalities and counties from federal revenue sharing.

It was estimated that in FY 1974 through FY 1978 the above allocation should produce $1,920,000 in additional revenue for schools. The report discusses all revenue sources but suggests that less reliance should be placed on the property tax as a source of financing schools as the revenue suggested above is made available to the schools.

In the section on Resources, recommendations were also made to improve assessment practice and the administration of the property tax both at the county and the state level.

The section on Dynamics dealt primarily with formula. A three-tiered approach was recommended. The report suggested that the support should consist of a first tier that would be a basic state grant to all children, a second tier of additional expenditures based upon equalizing expenditures by the state so that districts choosing equal tax efforts would receive equal revenue up to a fixed amount, and a third tier consisting solely of local funds.

The Task Force dealt with weighting pupils for whatever formula adopted and recommended the following weightings for pupils:

Kindergarten (½ day)	0.55
Grades 1 through 3	1.10
Grades 4 through 8	1.00
Grades 9 through 12	1.25

In addition, the report recommended that the above weightings be increased by 1.25 for students classified as disadvantaged.

Three alternative formulas were presented in keeping with the principles outlined in the report. One suggested a complete equalization of effort and expenditure after a block grant until all students received $1,000 or the proportionate share which the local district tax rate was of $3.42 in 12 grade districts and with proportionate tax rates for dual districts. After equalized expenditures at $1,000 per pupil a district could, through local effort in excess of the prescribed rate, spend whatever the citizens would authorize. This formula was designed to meet the "equal expenditure for equal effort" principle without any significant spending increase by the state.

Formula 2 of the report was a Resource Equalizer Formula designed to assure each WADA student the equivalent of $42,000 assessed value supporting his education. The state payment would be based on the local tax rate collected, multiplied by the difference in local assessment and the $42,000. (Example: local assessed value = $20,000 per WADA and the operation tax rate was $2.000. State aid would equal $42,000 - 20,000 = 22,000 x 2 = $440 per child.) This formula set $3.00, $1.05, and $1.95 as maximum tax rates for unit, high school, and elementary districts respectively and provided for a rollback of taxes above these levels.

Formula 3 was a Power Equalizer Formula that guaranteed varying levels of expenditure per $1 of tax effort ranging from $540 for a tax effort at $1.08 to $1,250 for a tax effort at $2.50.

All three of these formulas were designed either to equalize expenditures for the same effort or move toward that goal.

Formula 2 and 3 as suggested would cost considerable money and were recommended to be phased in over a period of four years if adopted.

The remaining part of the report dealt with specific changes to deal with the problems of the disadvantaged, school construction, the education of the handicapped, pupil transportation and personnel cost. Sections on each of these topics

describe the situation as it exists and make recommendations.

Final Report of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on School Finance

This Committee produced three volumes plus the final report which is summarized below. In the first three volumes, many of the problems of funding education were discussed by individual professors in prepared papers.

The final report of this Committee published in April of 1973 presents formulas to reduce inequities based on all of the traditional models with many interesting variations.

Chapter 2 discusses the foundation level concepts but proposes some interesting changes. One of the formulas suggested proposes to calculate aid using a qualifying rate but allows the district to choose a lower tax rate and still get the state's share of funds. The qualifying rate is simply used to determine equalization of state funds and then leaves the level of taxation in the local district to local decision about what level they wish to spend. A second proposal adds a compensatory student weighting with a concentration ratio. Each of the two models proposed uses a $1,050 foundation level. In addition, the chapter makes recommendations relating to the use of foundation level formula either in the short or long run.

Chapter 3 presents three models based on the principle of equal expenditure for equal effort. This approach calls for state and local sharing of cost based on the total current expenditure level with tax effort rather than taxable wealth as the basis of determining the expenditure level. Each of the approaches described in this chapter suggest moving to a $1,250 level of support with a unit tax rate of $2.50 and dual rates of $1.55. This chapter compares the use of a foundation level, a resource equalizer and a percentage equalizer formula with comparable tax rates and guaranteed assessment levels. By modifying each classic formula, it is shown that equal reward for equal tax effort can be maintained. One major suggestion in this chapter is a systematic way to measure educational need through weighting for identifiable need.

In Chapter 4 a number of variations of the equal expenditures for equal effort concept were developed. There is a discussion of the different effects of different formula. Several approaches are suggested and described in detail. There is a resource equalizer with a variable compensatory weighting and a mandatory roll-back provision and a three-tiered power equalizer formula both of which appear in this report and in the Finance Task Force of the Governor's Commission on Schools. A third formula called an operating cost formula is presented that suggests a $1,330 level based on ADM extensive weightings to assure proper recognition of need and with tax rates of $3, $2, and $1 respectively for unit, elementary, and high school districts. These formulas attempt to adapt to special situations and are designed to fit the Illinois situation.

Chapter 5 contains a description of a plan to achieve full state funding which is the plan supported by a plurality of the committee. This chapter must be read in detail to understand its implications. Two alternative plans are presented. The first would set the level of expenditures to be supported in the beginning at the 80th percentile level of current expenditure, freeze expenditures above this level and then through time raise all districts to the 80th percentile level of expenditure.

The second alternative would require reorganization of school districts into not more than 100 districts. A master plan would be developed for each district based on actual educational needs of students and differentials for regional and other cost differences. The local plan would have to adjust to the overall state plan to keep expenditures within a given total figure.

Full state funding would, it was pointed out, have to be phased in through time but would serve to reduce inequities between districts and regions. Although the committee did not agree to recommend a single formula, a plurality preferred a full funding program that provided aid to districts in the amount of the 90th percentile of current expenditure. (This varied from the 80th percentile recommended by the authors of Chapter 5.)

Chapter 6 outlines plans to move the state into the funding of capital outlay or the sharing in such funding. The alternatives suggested roughly parallel

the different approaches for funding operational expenses, foundation levels, equal support for equal effort and full statewide equalization. The advantages and disadvantages of each approach are detailed in the report and should be studied in detail by anyone considering this question.

Chapter 7 of the report deals with revenue. Recommendations on the improvement of the administration of the property tax are made and the use of statewide property tax is discussed and rejected except as a part of a full state funding package. Revenue sources available to the state are discussed and recommendations about the use of each is made. The chapter suggests that additional revenue will be available and recommends plans to establish priorities for the part that should be allocated to the public schools closely paralleling those recommended to the Finance Task Force of the Governor's Task Force.

The Business Management Task Force of the Governor's Commission on Schools

Mr. A. R. Evans on the staff of the Speaker of the House has provided a summary of the report which is reproduced below. As is true of the previous reports, this report must be read in detail to appreciate many of the details.

In January 1972 Governor Oglivie appointed a Business Management Task Force which was directed to:

Evaluate the effectiveness of control over all noninstructional operating and administrative costs.

Identify specific areas where improvement opportunities exist, then recommend action to realize more goods and services for each available tax dollar.

Provide long-range administrative guidelines to accommodate the future growth of elementary and secondary education.

Investigate the application and use of timely cost measurement reports for various levels of operations and costs in elementary and secondary education.

Coordinate and cooperate with other program efforts of the Governor's Commission on Schools.

In response to the request, 54 managers and executives were supplied without cost to the taxpayers. These managers and executives spent twelve full weeks on

the study. In addition, fifteen part-time special assistants were involved for varying lengths of time. More than 135 firms provided money and manpower. The Task Force spent more than 28,000 man hours and traveled nearly 200,000 miles in making the study. It is estimated that these 135 companies contributed $750,000 in cash and manpower.

The report includes 302 recommendations for improvement in public business and management practices. Of this number 61 would require legislative action, 40 would necessitate administrative change at the state level and 201 would call for administrative change at the local level.

The Task Force estimated that 44% of the $2.6 billion spent on elementary and high school education in the fiscal year of 1971 was for noninstructional purposes including administration, health services, building maintenance and operations, capital expenditures and debt service. The study concluded that $242 million could be saved on the operating expenses of Illinois schools.

Among the major proposals of the Task Force and the estimated savings were:

1.	Pooling of cash and investment funds to maximize earning power of assets	$38.4M
2.	Changing procedure in short term borrowing	5.6M
3.	Change bonding procedures	4.1M
4.	Major changes in funding the teacher retirement systems	56.5M
5.	Instituting collective purchasing system procedures	12.6M
6.	Improvement of transportation practices	19.0M
7.	Establishment of statewide health and accident insurance program	2.7M
8.	Centralizing building and maintenance operation at the district level	10.9M
9.	Centralizing lunch operations	7.6M
10.	Consolidation of all districts under 1,000 enrollment	6.4M
11.	Reduction in number of Educational Service Regions	4.1M

12.	Eliminate publishing of annual reports	1.14M
13.	Improve tax payment procedures	15.3M
14.	Consolidate and improve data processing procedure ($4.5M one time cost)	5.7M
15.	Revise accounts payable procedure	1.05M
16.	Establish competitive salary ranges and merit pay for administrative and clerical positions	4.6M
17.	Improve management practices concerning textbooks and library books ($6.3M one time cost)	3.01M
18.	Improving building operation and maintenance management	14.5M
19.	Develop facilities planning and space utilization	22.2M
20.	Utilization of public health services; and employment procedures	6.2M

The House Financing of Education Study Committee

This group did not produce a general report but instead has used the work of other commissions and staff research on which to base their recommendations. The chief thrust of their plan has been to increase support to local schools through an adjustment in the foundation level and to develop a plan to reduce property taxes as state aid increased. This group is continuing to study proposals submitted by the other groups.

All of the above groups have contributed much to the discussion of how best to fund education and each of the reports should be the basis of wide discussion on plans for the future of financing public education.

CHAPTER III

A PROPOSED NEGOTIATION BILL WITH THE RATIONALE FOR MAJOR POSITIONS

This proposal was written by Representative Gene L. Hoffman, based on research which he and Mr. Walter L. Bishop, Superintendent of the Educational Service Region for Montgomery County, Illinois, did in a class at Illinois State University.

This proposal is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the rationale for an "education only" approach to resolving conflicts in the education community. This is followed by a brief summary of each section of the bill with commentary on key issues.

The second part of this proposal is a draft bill, "Public School Collective Bargaining Act," which appears as Appendix F. The bill was developed by reviewing what is on "the books" in other states and by analyzing legislation introduced in previous sessions of the Illinois General Assembly.

In the introduction to a report on this subject prepared for the Education Commission of the States, Nolte and Linn referred to a statement by Victor Hugo in 1877 that "greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose time has come."

The time has come for the idea of legislation to provide guidelines to govern collective bargaining in the public school sector to proceed to reality. There should be no question in the mind of any reasonably objective observer that such legislation is needed. Each year there are more strikes or threats of strikes, and this trend does not appear to be going away. Also, the situations become more complex and difficult to resolve satisfactorily. The absence of legislative guidelines leaves the parties in the dark as to what their rights and responsibilities are, or leaves them prey to quests for power or recognition by individuals who take advantage of the void. Certainly is would be in order for the School Problems Commission to direct its attention to this problem and present a legislative solution.

The draft of a bill, which appears as Appendix F, would provide statutory guidelines for bargaining between school boards and public elementary and secondary school employees. Let us consider first the reasons for this type of legislation rather than a bill for all public employees before considering the provisions of the bill itself:

1. There is a whole body of law dealing specifically with the operation of public elementary and secondary schools, as well as a state office charged with the responsibility of supervising the operations of these school districts.

2. The service performed by teachers, as well as their employment arrangement, is such that they should not be grouped with all non-school public employees.

3. The influence that the teacher has or hopes to have in setting broad policy objectives is vastly different from that played by most other public employees.

4. A law designed to suit the purpose of labor oriented public employee groups is not necessarily one that can conform to the arrangements characteristic of public school teaching.

5. Some of the specific powers of school boards, including those related to budget preparation and taxing authority, are very different from those of governing bodies for other public employees.

6. The relationship between classroom teachers and other educational personnel is unique and requires that supervisors, specialists and the like not be arbitrarily excluded from teacher bargaining units, as would be expected under labor relations statutes.

7. There is a definite desire on the part of teachers for statutory guidelines, and an awareness on the part of the public as to the need; this problem should not continue because of an unreadiness or unwillingness to agree on guidelines for other public employees.

8. If this type of legislation is desired for employees of higher education institutions, it can be modified to suit their needs and introduced as a separate bill. The problems unique to higher education institutions and a lack of readiness in this area should not delay providing a solution for problems of the public elementary and secondary schools.

Now, let us direct our attention to the specifics of the draft submitted for consideration. In order to make it easier to follow the draft, the following discussion goes through the bill section by section: (See Appendix F for a copy of the proposed bill.)

Section 1. Title section.

Section 2. This section declaring public policy on the topic is referred to by some as excess verbiage; however, it does serve a purpose. It states in brief the content and purpose of the Act, and the reasons for its being exacted.

Section 3. This section defining terms for purpose of this Act is very important. The content of the definitions will sometimes be the basis upon which local procedures are established, Commission decisions rendered, or court decisions made. Also, much of the content of the sections following will be interpreted on the basis of these definitions. Perhaps a few definitions should be singled out:

Subsection (1). The Act covers all school district employees, certificated or non-certificated, except the two groups stated.

Subsection (2). This definition is designed to include any group that might legitimately represent employees in the negotiation process, but not designed to attempt to exclude a particular group with a legitimate claim to representation.

Subsection (6). This definition is on the basis of function rather than title. The responsibilities of principals, assistant principals, department heads, and the like, vary considerably from school district to school district.

Subsection (12). The Act calls for certain actions by the State Board of Education, but Section 14 provides that the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction can assume these duties temporarily if a State Board is not created by the legislature prior to this Act becoming effective.

Section 4. A "Bureau of School Employee Relations" is created to carry out the purposes of this Act. A Commission of 3 members have supervisory and policy making authority. The Bureau shall have an executive director and such other full-time staff as needed and provided for by appropriations. The Commission is a governmental administrative body with authority to make rules, hold hearings, render decisions, and the like. Of course, most of the day-by-day functions of the Bureau will be carried out by the executive director and his staff.

Section 5. This section contains four very important provisions:

Subsection (a). The obligation of school boards and employee representatives to engage in collective bargaining is clearly stated.

Subsection (b). Collective bargaining is defined.

Subsection (c). The scope of negotiations, both as to what is negotiable and what is not negotiable, is stated.

Subsection (d). Recognition of existing laws of the State is noted.

Section 6. The rights of employees are stated in general terms.

Section 7. The rights of employees and restrictions on school boards, administrative personnel, and employee organizations are spelled out in greater detail in this section dealing with unfair practices. Not only is this section very important for this reason, but it will very likely be the basis for many complaints filed with the Bureau, at least during the early months of operation under the Act.

It should be pointed out that although this Section deals primarily with the school board, its agents, and the representative of the employees, there are certain provisions to both insure rights for and restrict unfair practices by individual employees, or groups of employees not recognized at the representative.

Section 8. This section provides for the designation of an exclusive representative for bargaining purposes and, at the same time, maintains the right of individual freedom of expression. The representative may be selected by stipulation, if the majority organization is clearly demonstrated, or by a secret ballot election if there is a good faith doubt, or if another employee organization can demonstrate support of at least 30 per cent of the employees in the appropriate negotiating unit, as described in the petition.

If any problems arise relative to representation, or selection of the representative, the Bureau will take proper action to resolve the situation.

If any questions arise as to composition of the appropriate negotiating unit, the Bureau will decide, using the guidelines established, whether the unit should consist of all employees, or separate units, composed of some subdivision thereof. This provision is important in view of the great variation in size and structure of the school districts of the state.

Section 9. It is recognized that negotiations will not always be successful and that an impasse may occur. This section provides that either party may declare that an impasse has been reached and may request the Bureau to appoint a staff mediator. If the Bureau confirms that an impasse exists, a staff mediator shall proceed in whatever way seems appropriate to persuade the parties to resolve their differences and effect a mutually acceptable agreement. The mediator shall not act as a fact finder except with the consent of both parties.

Section 10. Any negotiated agreement may provide a grievance procedure to resolve disputes involving the interpretation, application or violation of the agreement. Such procedure may provide for binding arbitration of the grievance.

If a party fails, neglects or refuses to comply with an agreement, the aggrieved party may file a complaint with the Bureau seeking an order directing compliance.

Section 11. In the event one party alleges the other party is guilty of an unfair practice as described in Section 6, a complaint may be filed with the Bureau. Such complaint must state in specific terms the unfair practice and include particulars to substantiate the charge.

Section 12. This section regulates strikes in a manner that recognizes both the rights of employees and the public interest. It has become clear that strikes will sometimes occur, whether or not a law authorizes or forbids them. Recognizing this to be a fact of life, this section provides that a strike is unlawful during the term of an agreement, or if the negotiation and impasse procedures called for in this Act have not been followed.

In the event a strike does occur, a restraining order may not be granted except on the basis of findings of fact that the public health and safety is endangered by continuation of the strike, or that the representative has failed to utilize the impasse procedure described in Section 8.

By neither flatly prohibiting or authorizing strikes, this Act places an incentive on both parties to engage in good faith negotiations and to utilize mediation procedures in case of an impasse. Experience has demonstrated this will minimize the likelihood of a strike actually occurring.

Section 13. The handling of costs of various functions are spelled out to prevent a dispute over this question.

Section 14. The recognition of existing agreements, necessary modification of existing laws, and temporary responsibilities pending the creation of a State Board are covered in this Section.

Section 15. The Bureau is established as an administrative body whose decisions may be appealed through the courts under the "Administrative Review Act."

Section 16. The usual protection relative to any portion of the Act being held invalid or unconstitutional not jeopardizing the rest of the Act.

Section 17. The effective date is January 1, 1974. This date will give preparation time to parties having responsibilities under this Act without undue delay.

APPENDICES

These materials are furnished to preserve for comparison certain materials presented on a continuing basis in previous reports rather than as a part of the materials presented in the earlier pages of this report, except for Appendix F which is a part of Chapter 3.

APPENDIX A

STATE AID CLAIMS: 1940-1973[k]

Year	Flat Grants	Equalization	Summer School[e]	Total	% Flat Grants	% Equalization
1940-41	$ 8,248,992	$ 4,028,130		$ 12,277,122	(67.2)	(32.8)
1941-42	8,018,388	4,842,656		12,861,044	(62.3)	(37.7)
1943-44[a]	9,541,003	4,492,744		14,033,747	(64.0)	(36.0)
1944-45	9,235,163	3,588,679		12,823,842	(72.0)	(28.0)
1945-46	13,978,830	5,485,456		19,464,286	(71.8)	(28.2)
1946-47	13,816,556	5,462,968		19,279,524	(71.7)	(28.3)
1947-48	17,157,413	9,628,789		26,786,202	(64.1)	(35.9)
1949-50	18,094,670	30,816,064		48,910,734	(37.0)	(63.0)
1950-51	18,781,826	33,198,187		51,980,013	(36.1)	(63.9)
1951-52[b]	19,132,565	33,370,107		52,502,672	(36.4)	(63.6)
1952-53	19,490,130	28,664,268		48,154,398	(40.5)	(59.5)
1953-54	20,471,285	44,382,386		64,853,671	(31.6)	(68.4)
1954-55	21,782,198	58,207,729		79,989,927	(29.4)	(70.6)
1955-56	22,857,607	60,513,014		83,370,621	(27.4)	(72.6)
1956-57	24,855,310	68,604,048		93,459,358	(26.6)	(73.4)
1957-58	25,408,518	68,709,443		94,117,961	(27.0)	(73.0)
1958-59[c]	27,170,683	70,411,666		97,582,349	(27.8)	(72.2)
1959-60	65,439,968	89,354,702		154,794,670	(42.3)	(57.7)
1960-61	67,746,311	88,904.219		156,650,530	(43.2)	(56.8)
1961-62	69,898,778	93,926,594		163,825,372	(42.7)	(57.3)
1962-63[d]	74,070,079	108,163,420		182,233,499	(40.6)	(59.4)
1963-64	75,750,333	111,195,426		186,945,759	(40.5)	(59.5)
1964-65[e]	76,726,994	115,619,445		192,346,439	(39.9)	(60.1)
1965-66[f]	88,743,369	167,171,831	$ 2,086,365	258,001,565	(34.7)	(65.3)
1966-67[g]	93,201,510[h]	180,650,762	2,497,605	276,349,877	(34.0)[i]	(66.0)
1967-68[g]	14,376,619[h]	345,038,857	3,615,266	363,030,742	(4.0)[i]	(96.0)
1968-69[g]	14,625,691	351,016,580	4,047,500	369,689,771	(4.0)[i]	(96.0)
1969-70	7,930,447	593,240,798	5,692,987	601,171,245	1.32	98.68
1970-71	271,103	655,727,111[j]	8,587,182	683,581,771	0.04	99.96
1971-72	224,409	726,066,062[j]	11,327,862	726,290,471	0.04	99.96
1972-73	343,379	779,725,025[j]	13,671,532	780,068,405	0.05	99.95

[a] High schools started sharing regularly in flat grants.
[b] A big increase in assessed valuations.
[c] A big increase in flat grants.
[d] Does not include summer school.
[e] Summer school does not change % of equalization and flat grants since summer school funds are proportionate to the funds paid during the regular year.
[f] Based on basic claim calculated from September 1966 ADA.
[g] General State Aid to districts after Supplementary State Aid Claims were filed.
[h] Per cent flat grant is the General State Aid payments to flat grant districts.
[i] This figure represents amount of flat grant going to non-equalization districts. When districts draw equalization, they include flat grants. Future years will be calculated in this way.
[j] Includes density bonus.
[k] For data 1932-1940 see 11th School Problems Commission Report.

Data furnished by Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois.

APPENDIX B

ILLINOIS SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY COUNTIES

County	Number of Districts						
	1945	1954	1962	1966-67	1968-69	1970-71	1971-72[a]
Adams	174	18	9	5	5	5	5
Alexander	30	13	9	2	2	2	2
Bond	79	2	2	2	2	2	2
Boone	66	5	5	5	5	5	2
Brown	66	1	1	1	1	1	1
Bureau	174	56	40	31	30	28	24
Calhoun	40	10	3	3	3	3	3
Carroll	104	19	16	13	8	7	7
Cass	66	4	4	4	4	4	4
Champaign	223	26	20	19	19	19	19
Christian	149	10	10	10	10	10	10
Clark	104	11	5	5	5	5	5
Clay	104	23	17	15	15	13	6
Clinton	74	17	12	12	12	12	12
Coles	128	3	3	3	3	3	3
Cook	193	159	151	148	147	147	146
Crawford	127	12	10	7	7	7	4
Cumberland	89	2	2	2	2	2	2
DeKalb	158	20	18	12	12	11	10
DeWitt	100	6	4	3	3	3	3
Douglas	95	5	5	5	5	5	5
DuPage	78	59	54	52	51	50	47
Edgar	141	8	7	7	7	7	5
Edwards	42	1	1	1	1	1	1
Effingham	81	5	5	5	5	5	5
Fayette	150	6	5	5	5	5	5
Ford	114	11	6	6	6	5	5
Franklin	108	51	22	16	15	15	14

[a]As of September, 1972.

APPENDIX B (Continued)

ILLINOIS SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY COUNTIES

County	Number of Districts						
	1945	1954	1962	1966-67	1968-69	1970-71	1971-72
Fulton	203	31	16	16	14	13	13
Gallatin	58	19	4	3	3	3	3
Greene	104	12	6	3	3	3	3
Grundy	95	34	24	17	17	16	16
Hamilton	92	24	11	11	11	10	1
Hancock	177	40	19	13	13	12	8
Hardin	33	22	7	2	2	2	2
Henderson	73	20	4	3	3	3	2
Henry	175	14	11	11	11	11	11
Iroquois	214	21	20	20	19	15	15
Jackson	113	41	17	11	11	10	10
Jasper	111	11	11	11	10	10	1
Jefferson	145	52	21	20	19	19	19
Jersey	66	1	1	1	1	1	1
JoDaviess	117	17	7	7	7	7	7
Johnson	70	30	11	11	9	9	9
Kane	112	11	9	9	9	9	9
Kankakee	153	22	15	14	14	14	14
Kendall	60	17	12	9	7	6	6
Knox	172	6	6	6	6	6	6
Lake	109	72	62	57	55	55	55
LaSalle	281	58	48	38	37	37	37
Lawrence	78	31	21	19	18	17	2
Lee	164	29	8	7	7	7	6
Livingston	258	29	25	20	20	19	19
Logan	125	26	19	19	17	14	14
Macon	131	9	8	8	8	8	8
Macoupin	185	10	9	9	9	9	9
Madison	133	15	15	15	15	15	15
Marion	129	42	15	15	14	14	14

APPENDIX B (Continued)

ILLINOIS SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY COUNTIES

County	Number of Districts						
	1945	1954	1962	1966-67	1968-69	1970-71	1971-72
Marshall	87	10	9	7	7	6	6
Mason	97	31	6	6	6	6	6
Massac	46	15	12	12	12	12	11
McDonough	154	7	7	7	7	7	7
McHenry	129	34	28	26	24	22	22
McLean	273	18	15	15	13	13	13
Menard	61	5	5	3	3	3	3
Mercer	119	13	4	4	4	4	4
Monroe	47	3	3	3	3	3	3
Montgomery	148	8	5	5	5	5	5
Morgan	113	12	5	5	5	5	5
Moultrie	74	3	3	3	3	3	3
Ogle	172	45	23	20	18	12	12
Peoria	152	63	50	41	35	18	18
Perry	77	24	14	13	11	10	9
Piatt	92	7	5	6	6	6	5
Pike	172	8	7	7	7	7	7
Pope	61	23	1	1	1	1	1
Pulaski	31	21	13	2	2	2	2
Putnam	31	17	10	2	2	2	2
Randolph	99	15	13	8	8	8	8
Richland	92	2	2	2	2	2	2
Rock Island	97	27	9	9	9	9	9
St. Clair	125	55	44	33	33	29	28
Saline	91	46	16	8	4	4	4
Sangamon	177	17	14	14	14	14	12
Schuyler	92	1	1	1	1	1	1
Scott	52	1	2	2	2	2	2
Shelby	176	11	11	11	11	11	9
Stark	73	17	14	13	13	6	5

APPENDIX B (Continued)

ILLINOIS SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY COUNTIES

County	Number of Districts						
	1945	1954	1962	1966-67	1968-69	1970-71	1971-72
Stephenson	139	33	6	6	6	5	5
Tazewell	140	41	33	27	26	23	22
Union	78	22	10	9	9	7	7
Vermilion	194	61	45	37	35	26	26
Wabash	39	2	2	2	2	2	2
Warren	128	24	5	5	5	5	5
Washington	85	30	14	13	13	12	11
Wayne	159	32	19	18	17	17	16
White	114	21	14	13	13	7	7
Whiteside	149	69	46	40	27	21	15
Will	175	48	38	33	33	33	32
Williamson	111	25	18	5	5	5	5
Winnebago	110	39	37	30	29	14	12
Woodford	119	13	9	9	9	9	9
Corrections							1[c]
Totals	11,955	2,349	1,549	1,340	1,279	1,175[a]	1,091[b]

[a]Four of the 1,175 districts were non-operating during 1970-71.

[b]Six of the 1,091 districts were non-operating during 1971-72. Reduction of school districts 1944-1945 to 1971-1972 school year: 10,864.

[c]A correction district to work with education in correction institutions is state wide.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS 1971-1972

Elementary	508
Secondary	146
Unit	436
Corrections	1
	1,091 districts

Data furnished by Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois.

APPENDIX C

SELECTED BIENNIAL STATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES, 1911-1973, WITH TOTAL COST COMPARISONS

Biennium	Biennial Appropriations for School Purposes[a]	Total Cost of School Operations[b]	% State Appropriations to Operating Costs
1911-13	$ 4,114,000	$ 53,006,371	7.8
1913-15	6,114,000	57,705,351	10.6
1915-17	8,164,500	64,163,760	12.7
1917-19	8,384,598	80,250,975	10.4
1919-21	12,872,950	103,260,249	12.5
1921-23	17,142,568	185,667,449	9.2
1925-27	17,242,568	200,239,934	8.6
1927-29	17,242,844	225,356,579	7.7
1929-31	21,291,668	239,201,642	8.9
1931-33	22,299,879	256,825,256	8.7
1933-35	21,298,364	198,429,402	10.7
1935-37	28,120,694	235,553,924	11.9
1937-39	27,807,228	241,909,561	11.5
1939-41	32,715,000	255,223,548	12.9
1941-43	34,609,500	271,416,214	12.8
1943-45	41,752,770	310,696,498	13.4
1945-47	54,929,816	376,958,792	14.6
1947-49	84,140,304	487,074,709	17.3
1949-51	124,247,752	571,007,872	21.8
1951-53	151,114,626	689,736,361	21.9
1953-55	173,566,865	825,864,027	21.0
1955-57	228,276,850	1,018,791,875	22.4
1957-59	247,038,000	1,325,000,000	18.6
1959-61	361,000,000	1,447,314,243	24.9
1961-63	428,352,993	1,783,385,641	24.0
1963-65	494,922,407	2,057,154,936	24.0
1965-67	653,892,662[c]	2,556,894,848	25.5
1967-69	961,486,672[c]	3,210,916,139	29.9
1969-70	778,097,826[cd]	1,993,163,392	39.0
1970-71	884,517,140	2,287,806,048	38.7
1971-72	943,942,644	--	--
1972-73	1,047,394,278		

[a] Includes only appropriations made for Special Education, the Common School Fund, Transportation and Vocational Education.

[b] Actual money spent by school districts.

[c] Includes deficiency appropriation recommended.

[d] Annual appropriations begin.

All data furnished by Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois.

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL STATISTICS BY COUNTIES

County	Total District[a]	Elementary ADA (Best 6 Mos.)	High School ADA (Best 6 Mos.)	Total ADA (Best 6 Mos.)	Elem. Tchrs.[b]	High School Tchrs.[b]	Total Teachers[b]	Total Assessed Valuation[c]	Assessed Valuation (Best 6 Mos. ADA)[d]	District With Lowest AV Per Pupil	District With Highest AV Per Pupil
Adams	5	$ 8,858.26	$ 3,748.27	$ 12,606.53	449.9	184.3	634.2	$ 305,140,032	$25,414	$18,643	$ 26,515
Alexander	2	1,521.07	599.32	2,120.99	88.0	47.0	135.0	22,762,450	12,487	6,734	16,972
Bond	2	2,071.9[illegible]	866.45	2,938.44	96.5	48.0	144.5	46,892,281	16,954	16,455	17,092
Boone	2	4,121.63	726.39	5,848.02	213.0	95.0	308.0	165,881,620	28,445	22,597	65,754
Brown	1	713.[illegible]	361.25	1,075.10	35.8	22.6	58.4	24,918,650	24,504	same	same
Bureau	24	6,092.69	2,467.14	8,559.83	338.4	160.7	499.1	386,705,708	46,358	16,484	129,497
Calhoun	[illegible]	602.65	339.52	942.17	33.1	23.8	56.9	22,599,235	23,414	14,721	63,438
Carroll	7	3,300.33	1,415.36	4,715.69	172.2	112.1	284.3	92,405,155	21,199	12,757	33,809
Cass	4	2,116.15	908.93	3,025.08	115.0	60.2	175.2	64,806,904	22,148	16,087	30,060
Champaign	19	20,816.56	8,078.29	28,894.85	1,249.5	413.9	1,663.4	709,405,902	25,406	8,452	100,025
Christian	10	5,556.69	2,47[illegible].09	8,029.78	285.5	145.6	431.1	205,446,491	26,696	11,318	47,601
Clark	5	2,536.77	1,148.56	3,685.33	146.0	85.0	231.0	63,375,435	19,061	15,027	77,079
Clay	6	2,374.69	1,099.81	3,474.50	124.9	59.5	184.4	109,843,790	30,630	16,087	73,105
Clayton	12	4,338.96	1,174.83	5,513.79	200.5	72.5	273.0	125,070,734	24,398	8,287	86,736
Coles	3	5,805.66	2,748.21	8,553.87	333.5	122.1	455.6	192,986,151	23,937	21,565	28,436
Cook	146	664,942.57	249,067.38	914,009.95	36,128.4	15,943.1	52,071.5	31,453,980,709	32,450	6,931	252,495
Crawford	4	3,006.27	1,361.74	4,368.01	147.5	90.5	238.0	105,891,851	25,375	18,457	62,710
Cumberland	2	1,529.58	650.01	2,179.59	67.0	37.0	104.0	36,599,970	18,336	18,094	18,698
DeKalb	10	9,483.10	4,029.44	13,512.54	538.6	240.9	779.5	320,825,368	24,947	18,424	65,658
DeWitt	3	2,420.39	984.72	3,405.11	141.7	69.3	211.0	86,502,423	26,733	22,005	43,618
Douglas	5	3,301.72	1,454.62	4,756.34	163.0	99.8	262.8	156,207,594	34,019	33,456	50,118
DuPage	47	80,725.71	33,855.86	114,581.57	4,000.3	1,695.5	5,695.8	4,128,639,343	34,887	8,982	310,207
Edgar	5	3,161.97	1,430.12	4,592.09	181.8	77.2	259.0	145,714,970	31,140	15,353	79,510
Edwards	1	871.23	440.70	1,311.93	44.0	25.0	69.0	26,948,289	19,484	same	same
Effingham	5	3,747.17	1,744.13	5,491.30	195.0	78.0	273.0	99,353,334	18,823	13,448	24,116
Fayette	5	2,719.08	1,303.84	4,022.92	140.4	84.0	224.4	84,873,052	22,441	19,364	32,329
Ford	5	2,678.47	1,272.37	3,950.84	131.9	72.3	203.3	115,399,376	30,888	20,880	49,210
Franklin	14	5,301.00	2,235.69	7,526.69	256.2	135.5	391.7	123,181,644	18,363	9,259	53,425
Fulton	13	7,537.03	3,096.43	10,633.46	393.5	172.9	566.4	245,316,872	23,576	12,132	65,216
Gallatin	3	1,037.57	438.93	1,476.50	67.5	28.5	96.0	32,690,924	22,324	17,108	30,096
Greene	3	2,449.88	1,092.68	3,542.56	125.4	63.9	189.3	70,708,296	21,165	17,458	25,682
Grundy	16	4,551.79	2,082.76	6,634.55	252.4	98.0	350.4	358,640,587	48,542	10,309	120,345
Hamilton	1	1,154.35	512.14	1,666.49	77.0	34.0	111.0	53,353,865	35,718	17,964	61,379
Hancock	8	3,894.58	1,805.78	5,700.36	223.2	135.9	359.1	168,213,246	30,881	14,714	85,931
Hardin	2	727.58	339.16	1,066.74	43.0	25.0	68.0	14,684,515	13,280	12,357	14,345
Henderson	2	1,221.99	474.72	1,696.71	57.1	37.5	94.6	40,190,080	25,239	21,057	42,053
Henry	11	8,658.97	3,509.66	12,168.63	394.6	207.4	602.0	242,596,415	21,111	5,890	33,099
Iroquois	15	5,434.28	2,447.14	7,881.42	307.7	157.0	464.7	247,442,468	32,422	19,703	134,715
Jackson	10	6,370.12	2,716.94	9,087.06	324.0	165.0	489.0	194,955,395	23,258	10,826	58,543
Jasper	1	1,597.52	767.10	2,364.62	81.3	40.3	121.6	91,778,417	40,381	20,250	61,473
Jefferson	19	4,857.63	1,951.49	6,809.12	221.3	108.9	330.2	166,235,113	26,363	9,733	60,233
Jersey	1	2,504.73	1,198.89	3,703.62	118.0	62.0	180.0	59,691,987	17,300	same	same
JoDaviess	7	3,167.80	1,552.24	4,720.04	150.7	94.0	244.7	81,961,785	17,956	13,072	23,803
Johnson	9	1,111.17	480.38	1,591.55	53.6	25.3	78.9	43,948,123	25,630	9,293	50,079
Kane	9	46,352.89	17,235.35	63,588.24	2,462.2	781.4	3,243.6	1,134,186,775	18,230	13,670	27,683
Kankakee	14	14,137.22	5,731.44	19,868.66	630.0	315.7	945.7	485,977,068	25,651	6,861	56,981
Kendall	6	5,076.78	1,848.63	6,925.41	235.0	112.0	347.0	162,322,602	23,892	18,883	97,440
Knox	6	8,556.56	3,653.33	12,209.89	479.8	178.5	658.3	254,571,053	22,013	16,950	33,644
Lake	55	58,305.23	25,463.57	83,768.80	2,947.9	1,382.0	4,329.9	2,933,466,890	33,475	9,830	109,973
LaSalle	37	15,516.98	7,389.62	22,906.60	781.1	401.2	1,182.3	1,094,197,985	49,984	15,741	154,894
Lawrence	2	2,592.73	1,186.75	3,779.48	126.8	80.9	207.7	140,303,880	43,224	17,606	93,396
Lee	6	5,253.20	2,229.89	7,483.09	285.0	139.0	424.0	196,129,353	27,385	23,070	64,075
Livingston	19	6,455.71	2,946.63	9,402.34	370.8	214.7	585.5	402,508,190	44,520	24,914	126,908
Logan	14	3,901.53	1,736.48	5,638.01	225.6	131.3	356.9	342,351,141	63,163	26,924	204,557
Macon	8	18,714.26	8,146.67	26,860.93	834.5	396.4	1,230.9	504,243,658	19,655	13,639	27,762
Macoupin	9	7,552.06	3,356.84	10,898.90	350.6	170.0	520.6	149,643,250	14,054	9,440	25,402
Madison	15	38,912.62	17,618.03	56,530.65	2,036.7	788.6	2,825.3	1,057,307,511	19,423	8,635	56,734
Marion	14	6,107.80	3,894.32	9,002.12	255.9	167.[illegible]	423.1	235,359,950	28,024	11,581	57,200
Marshall	6	2,037.45	1,032.45	3,069.90	107.0	76.0	183.0	104,673,874	36,402	24,069	80,046
Mason	6	2,815.21	1,086.39	3,901.60	129.7	92.6	222.3	125,204,725	32,808	26,770	58,197
Massac	11	2,182.60	983.88	3,166.48	105.3	58.0	163.3	110,843,305	35,518	3,710	37,191
McDonough	7	3,786.59	1,695.66	5,482.24	218.5	107.0	325.5	154,978,651	29,536	19,166	12,16[illegible]
McHenry	22	17,465.28	7,322.02	24,787.30	857.0	400.5	1,257.5	825,176,788	33,504	21,672	80,893
McLean	13	14,504.17	5,886.08	20,390.25	879.5	437.2	1,316.7	598,273,501	30,205	24,224	179,[illegible]94
Menard	3	1,808,12	701.48	3,509.60	92.0	57.0	149.0	72,303.328	27,096	22,944	41,215
Mercer	4	3,323.14	1,359.92	4,683.06	158.5	81.0	239.5	84,908,594	18,816	12,792	2[illegible],293
Monroe	3	2,552.13	1,177.95	3,730.08	121.4	71.9	193.3	82,235,199	17,861	15,474	[illegible]1,317
Montgomery	5	4,431.56	2,099.94	6,531.50	232.0	111.5	343.5	135,329,371	21,718	10,705	32,149
Morgan	5	4,894.45	2,002.65	6,897.10	246.6	134.8	381.4	217,297,992	29,846	24,984	50,632
Moultrie	3	1,661.44	720.03	2,381.47	96.5	50.0	146.[illegible]	67,713,385	29,817	25,168	38,392
Ogle	12	7,725.53	3,188.25	10,913.78	373.1	200.8	573.9	281,862,429	27,058	15,396	80,464
Peoria	18	26,085.38	10,163.56	36,248.94	1,266.1	580.1	1,846.2	1,069,984,694	29,631	12,854	282,376
Perry	9	2,267.66	1,203.72	3,471.38	112.0	64.0	176.0	86,254,949	24,03[illegible]	14,441	61,046

APPENDIX D (Continued)

SCHOOL STATISTICS BY COUNTIES

County	Total District[a]	Elementary ADA (Best 6 Mos.)	High School ADA (Best 6 Mos.)	Total ADA (Best 6 Mos.)	Elem. Tchrs.[b]	High School Tchrs.[b]	Total Teachers[b]	Total Assessed Valuation[c]	Assessed Valuation (Best 6 Mos. ADA)[d]	District With Lowest AV Per Pupil	District With Highest AV Per Pupil
Piatt	5	$ 3,543.75	$ 1,518.67	$ 5,062.42	192.7	105.7	298.4	$ 305,438,480	$61,348	$30,280	$104,019
Pike	7	2,913.25	1,299.12	4,212.37	154.3	88.7	243.0	88,169,161	22,050	16,817	70,006
Pope	1	523.58	209.24	732.82	26.5	10.6	37.1	10,825,175	12,477	same	same
Pulaski	2	1,629.50	694.32	2,323.82	84.0	41.0	125.0	15,372,438	6,462	5,210	9,326
Putnam	2	877.46	319.63	1,197.09	58.0	20.0	78.0	86,678,193	74,328	69,335	74,582
Randolph	8	3,379.09	1,949.32	5,328.41	169.0	117.0	286.0	131,274,941	21,092	11,172	62,522
Richland	2	2,594.67	1,209.52	3,804.19	91.0	61.4	152.4	59,992,479	16,189	16,146	16,418
Rock Island	9	24,043.00	10,107.30	34,150.20	1,180.6	421.0	1,601.6	731,884,989	23,018	13,295	51,846
St. Clair	28	40,823.23	15,512.80	56,336.03	1,856.5	762.0	2,618.5	1,090,054,095	19,367	7,199	56,040
Saline	4	3,575.91	1,448.82	5,024.73	187.0	92.0	279.0	58,388,556	12,968	12,279	17,912
Sangamon	12	21,211.88	8,779.21	29,991.09	1,112.4	424.7	1,537.1	681,179,756	23,969	12,084	79,416
Schuyler	1	1,028.36	486.92	1,515.28	59.3	23.0	82.3	30,016,160	20,830	same	same
Scott	2	1,026.66	422.25	1,448.91	55.5	29.4	84.9	35,828,627	23,493	23,190	24,261
Shelby	9	3,350.71	1,505.41	4,856.12	187.0	99.2	286.2	129,843,084	28,047	20,553	68,903
Stark	5	1,359.29	682.68	2,041.97	94.2	36.0	130.2	86,119,225	42,873	33,896	86,728
Stephenson	5	7,296.00	3,019.54	10,315.54	390.5	150.5	541.0	181,110,473	18,760	15,516	20,312
Tazewell	22	19,703.89	7,932.47	27,636.46	881.5	409.7	1,291.2	917,675,784	34,300	8,929	86,503
Union	7	2,569.73	1,073.76	3,643.49	144.5	66.0	210.5	81,678,558	21,723	8,998	42,352
Vermilion	26	14,289.74	5,927.62	20,217.36	765.3	325.1	1,090.4	452,222,966	23,121	10,783	193,102
Wabash	2	1,726.93	926.18	2,653.11	102.5	54.6	157.1	58,780,944	19,716	19,348	19,748
Warren	5	3,277.97	1,411.93	4,689.90	174.9	71.0	245.9	116,222,702	25,519	12,958	41,311
Washington	11	1,387.49	740.78	2,128.27	78.0	45.1	123.1	122,794,878	59,774	22,353	123,582
Wayne	16	2,450.42	1,029.05	3,479.47	123.9	61.5	185.4	106,016,947	33,952	11,403	76,182
White	7	2,815.79	1,277.52	4,093.31	151.9	93.3	245.2	84,065,051	21,410	18,108	34,890
Whiteside	15	11,339.18	4,629.13	15,968.31	588.9	257.4	846.3	480,756,566	31,568	13,510	79,317
Will	32	39,377.21	14,510.27	53,887.48	1,841.1	758.7	2,599.8	1,823,748,697	32,183	8,883	135,784
Williamson	5	7,132.47	2,876.47	10,008.94	355.5	122.0	477.5	124,588,419	13,006	11,925	22,796
Winnebago	12	38,960.30	14,463.58	53,423.88	2,018.5	716.7	2,735.2	1,155,315,783	22,027	14,103	58,838
Woodford	9	4,960.41	2,171.57	7,131.98	238.5	142.0	380.5	194,176,374	28,312	10,605	49,126
Corrections	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Totals	1,091	$1,515,137.35	$603,639.69	$2,118,777.04	79,287.6	35,142.6	114,430.2	$64,080,596,141	$29,584	--	--

[a] This is the status as of September, 1972.

[b] Numbers represent full-time equivalent teachers for 1971-72. Previous year's figures represent headcounts.

[c] 1970 assessed valuations.

[d] Figures are based on 1969 assessed valuations and 1970-71 best 6 months ADA.

Data furnished by Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois.

APPENDIX E

SCHOOL STATISTICS BY COUNTIES 1970-1971
INCOME BY COUNTY FROM STATE AND FEDERAL SOURCES

County	General State Aid	Vocational Education[a]	Summer School	Gifted	Special Education	Transportation[b]	Total State Funds	Total Federal Funds
Adams	$ 3,845,686.23	$ 189,489.00	$ 45,666.69	$ 11,213.09	$ 267,920.52	$ 277,848.77	$ 4,669,180.39	$ 717,282.63
Alexander	887,211.66	46,105.00	--	5,369.39	125,638.00	50,224.65	1,141,645.02	448,324.14
Bond	1,163,965.86	33,846.00	--	4,776.44	33,904.36	78,494.76	1,306,682.42	160,982.92
Boone	1,768,975.86	45,986.00	22,875.48	--	49,990.57	75,897.93	1,961,788.24	106,206.57
Brown	338,192.82	11,845.00	--	334.55	4,674.08	55,944.89	412,654.19	103,927.49
Bureau	1,692,670.98	65,134.00	1,380.00	212.00	89,196.24	236,657.97	2,116,039.33	260,297.02
Calhoun	383,054.60	16,692.00	--	--	9,064.23	35,595.07	442,217.98	81,881.89
Carroll	1,641,081.81	69,995.00	--	3,992.48	13,092.83	163,822.24	1,877,084.02	297,274.11
Cass	1,024,499.56	43,560.00	--	--	41,336.34	52,878.38	1,172,470.47	149,822.31
Champaign	9,887,514.41	277,615.00	177,453.23	68,397.34	957,670.15	314,100.57	13,716,561.36	3,076,589.98
Christian	2,405,965.49	68,484.63	1,329.00	7,734.01	9,976.85	181,963.63	2,723,638.13	311,259.14
Clark	1,471,401.34	60,465.41	159.53	6,211.32	63,260.15	149,999.83	1,748,560.01	88,420.88
Clay	1,057,212.	48,588.50	2,437.71	2,648.30	37,279.34	130,725.60	1,279,619.76	184,725.89
Clinton	2,008,113.	55,024.00	11,505.33	4,026.37	21,765.33	138,624.93	2,270,726.75	232,706.12
Coles	2,743,425.46	105,839.60	62,938.82	36,045.16	123,723.83	131,413.46	3,194,888.91	242,345.27
Cook	305,433,233.56	9,385,476.38	6,335,643.60	1,491,265.59	20,058,205.70	5,059,640.32	356,071,122.81	95,822,104.58
Crawford	1,484,761.76	72,635.00	243.50	758.87	38,194.83	126,697.45	1,707,204.61	190,622.78
Cumberland	851,855.36	38,785.00	17,872.42	3,603.35	28,402.88	124,189.79	1,056,282.51	104,864.70
DeKalb	4,240,118.33	212,594.00	8,485.94	54,123.20	467,756.10	269,761.15	5,324,720.95	550,345.54
DeWitt	990,208.49	40,011.00	3,021.34	480.15	78,571.12	43,180.18	1,152,221.51	148,360.54
Douglas	1,012,303.28	54,977.22	487.50	5,149.53	38,202.04	90,713.64	1,223,252.81	148,574.98
DuPage	32,851,981.05	934,560.72	371,289.56	96,163.82	2,141,393.19	1,425,062.11	37,570,912.31	2,286,442.26
Edgar	1,211,980.69	56,561.00	8,449.10	1,855.45	40,200.90	134,894.07	1,449,201.61	233,931.13
Edwards	507,576.14	--	4,526.87	2,494.40	7,303.67	59,365.71	587,620.14	45,595.98
Effingham	2,151,408.98	84,447.00	34,244.25	2,869.29	29,239.78	119,440.54	2,433,186.27	223,887.45
Fayette	1,417,822.49	48,907.00	5,481.22	3,096.15	18,663.15	122,702.88	1,640,933.42	223,355.51
Ford	1,057,366.81	43,758.00	2,012.00	4,509.34	9,836.82	63,736.76	1,183,228.24	298,265.92
Franklin	3,048,901.79	105,210.00	31,054.05	9,596.01	105,748.35	138,473.89	3,447,693.93	395,714.02
Fulton	3,624,650.67	99,194.00	11,530.35	10,590.10	145,065.14	348,122.25	4,238,238.81	395,171.45
Gallatin	531,421.72	31,842.00	--	1,148.25	1,113.37	53,749.21	616,527.78	143,067.71
Greene	1,259,351.49	31,615.00	--	2,829.66	23,847.42	114,970.46	1,445,063.88	218,178.70
Grundy	1,308,067.73	62,076.00	--	740.16	25,723.13	154,578.89	1,551,601.33	231,063.27
Hamilton	458,241.29	37,195.00	--	1,634.01	15,625.96	84,126.56	588,811.65	131,688.14
Hancock	1,669,643.96	88,471.00	48.00	11,931.69	140,780.07	225,214.63	2,131,205.40	347,468.01
Hardin	486,707.45	15,739.00	--	--	5,915.30	58,163.78	577,519.59	153,273.85
Henderson	488,925.15	19,383.00	--	572.00	21,362.75	68,865.26	600,194.77	117,079.73
Henry	4,342,612.31	180,504.00	1,500.00	2,891.96	13,687.47	310,175.43	4,834,088.03	407,253.76
Iroquois	1,992,943.39	86,107.00	--	1,148.17	22,353.15	224,315.43	2,288,758.11	343,871.93
Jackson	3,198,649.33	189,188.00	38,110.17	25,968.17	256,198.07	314,389.98	4,578,733.30	818,227.94
Jasper	560,714.26	35,685.32	--	1,044.82	23,746.96	125,583.80	743,568.63	112,565.31
Jefferson	2,299,198.21	185,570.00	--	9,946.40	55,426.96	186,393.29	2,714,059.43	578,910.02
Jersey	1,431,551.84	58,448.00	9,997.48	5,869.24	26,220.25	92,624.44	1,639,757.93	256,197.74
JoDaviess	1,854,627.02	59,654.00	2,617.27	5,123.12	67,143.54	176,885.92	2,159,470.94	249,674.61
Johnson	554,463.55	19,526.00	--	--	8,141.69	81,966.33	686,741.99	126,985.08
Kane	25,505,675.53	537,722.75	44,683.14	80,708.94	1,288,976.04	1,001,842.21	28,568,726.80	1,191,030.74
Kankakee	6,354,357.39	241,140.00	51,198.50	1,350.48	195,285.89	460,363.48	7,627,522.54	1,268,391.46
Kendall	2,323,454.65	58,907.00	--	2,084.88	29,757.07	132,447.25	2,540,257.90	118,924.68
Knox	4,046,411.83	212,556.93	16,029.30	12,798.49	26,357.10	255,375.09	4,553,099.38	454,251.41
Lake	24,512,735.44	691,006.00	202,919.73	48,099.69	990,165.35	1,421,484.15	29,508,112.65	4,530,136.99
LaSalle	4,185,966.78	181,877.00	10,433.00	5,061.90	220,717.77	355,511.32	5,006,776.73	617,655.29
Lawrence	834,119.90	40,675.00	1,339.22	876.70	15,245.97	119,148.43	1,024,534.98	213,204.20
Lee	2,094,768.58	77,692.00	2,677.86	421.72	68,690.43	146,858.42	2,567,202.25	249,901.81
Livingston	1,850,289.07	147,438.00	3,065.00	4,925.26	163,871.23	209,843.81	2,459,928.01	366,755.36
Logan	905,059.38	56,698.00	11,556.62	4,561.67	78,803.22	93,865.53	1,436,195.48	162,139.46
Macon	10,495,564.91	358,755.00	276,334.00	64,425.05	183,909.67	407,513.09	12,536,586.02	1,156,438.12
Macoupin	4,657,274.24	142,212.00	43,314.60	9,485.09	77,487.51	269,395.20	5,214,754.93	429,174.90
Madison	22,971,579.60	677,870.40	611,570.21	93,679.95	892,528.44	703,317.12	26,663,034.69	3,215,430.92
Marion	2,875,299.32	174,706.00	15,322.89	9,200.15	94,479.44	229,676.75	3,449,233.60	604,142.47
Marshall	697,098.66	30,126.00	340.00	--	20,137.87	102,294.38	845,372.99	97,288.22
Mason	880,510.34	34,496.00	3,409.95	1,411.86	5,404.35	81,898.92	1,038,284.85	165,797.64
Massac	1,287,343.17	61,570.33	1,168.73	1,139.16	7,016.98	68,108.80	1,434,176.56	269,598.79
McDonough	1,451,633.02	115,780.00	661.65	2,715.07	108,833.55	118,000.73	1,783,255.27	248,786.95
McHenry	6,703,183.98	207,722.17	40,103.23	17,062.12	257,738.62	537,843.32	7,770,168.68	610,968.27
McLean	5,293,200.15	278,038.10	12,797.53	7,982.86	250,681.12	359,693.58	6,260,886.24	705,538.00
Menard	718,346.08	27,841.00	17,479.63	684.00	10,097.79	67,023.25	898,235.55	70,073.42
Mercer	1,744,221.72	35,619.00	--	2,099.00	38,080.69	179,795.36	2,001,215.27	224,541.94
Monroe	1,497,340.88	56,375.00	18,737.17	3,916.11	35,962.86	131,130.95	1,734,266.17	139,724.42
Montgomery	2,293,068.70	68,297.44	--	3,665.02	76,965.85	188,653.33	2,647,968.24	306,624.06
Morgan	1,735,981.53	64,075.00	25,154.00	6,308.00	219,719.35	116,984.51	2,322,296.79	351,661.85
Moultrie	612,412.78	26,712.00	13,744.19	2,327.60	28,914.45	46,075.69	728,950.85	103,570.92
Ogle	3,492,558.34	81,107.28	900.00	1,923.91	32,984.88	268,622.15	3,902,648.58	336,286.98
Peoria	10,818,397.71	268,403.00	160,134.98	44,407.46	762,117.94	663,583.59	13,631,997.23	1,699,741.55
Perry	1,245,694.64	73,844.00	1,716.90	2,039.66	29,217.82	94,279.40	1,432,514.67	174,620.94
Piatt	617,320.74	48,666.00	1,677.00	2,769.58	38,326.29	126,707.07	852,038.64	165,909.98
Pike	1,476,204.07	53,426.00	6,847.73	2,163.29	28,841.38	174,040.04	1,741,144.76	255,838.35

APPENDIX E (Continued)

SCHOOL STATISTICS BY COUNTIES 1970-1971
INCOME BY COUNTY FROM STATE AND FEDERAL SOURCES

County	General State Aid	Vocational Education[a]	Summer School	Gifted	Special Education	Transportation[b]	Total State Funds	Total Federal Funds
Pope	$ 303,660.79	$ 16,363.00	$ --	$ --	$ 2,138.14	$ 48,226.95	$ 383,115.54	$ 124,335.24
Pulaski	1,191,153.96	72,057.00	--	3,714.87	113,016.67	62,882.88	1,455,641.43	662,408.03
Putnam	68,980.00	5,130.00	--	1,159.00	4,886.00	23,898.00	105,681.00	28,494.00
Randolph	1,954,098.29	102,337.00	43,438.81	1,262.92	168,713.97	181,364.22	2,456,706.20	252,015.91
Richland	1,532,437.89	55,790.00	3,031.90	--	22,835.17	91,065.40	1,694,382.16	154,838.80
Rock Island	12,420,745.30	465,638.00	42,235.53	35,896.90	294,562.79	294,341.12	13,556,318.66	1,823,420.07
St. Clair	23,966,934.94	495,498.20	102,636.30	107,093.22	675,864.71	935,219.64	27,562,773.26	7,093,394.05
Saline	2,273,845.09	69,490.00	190.00	4,441.24	48,011.86	135,786.06	2,583,880.63	459,135.19
Sangamon	10,960,636.64	269,803.47	165,037.34	46,197.79	653,829.63	375,450.27	13,554,038.89	1,198,509.89
Schuyler	528,376.41	18,062.00	--	2,021.09	56,238.72	74,572.97	679,794.24	54,962.17
Scott	496,062.77	18,793.00	--	490.29	11,612.58	59,519.93	584,374.22	72,053.95
Shelby	1,489,428.75	60,751.00	12,089.24	4,211.70	30,025.99	152,872.59	1,747,052.77	252,365.15
Stark	352,453.86	20,215.00	--	--	5,920.66	106,781.77	477,199.87	68,085.17
Stephenson	3,864,202.05	63,358.00	58,653.50	62,813.41	141,186.68	206,089.48	4,467,624.26	452,858.16
Tazewell	7,646,287.25	145,122.00	44,442.07	22,787.89	97,952.04	331,829.92	8,297,463.86	515,979.04
Union	1,332,365.61	62,296.00	--	1,086.84	78,928.48	111,160.64	1,683,860.53	252,122.13
Vermilion	7,577,256.55	182,754.80	17,499.35	30,972.67	281,373.46	329,722.23	8,450,323.75	824,782.35
Wabash	1,022,595.00	44,610.00	1,426.70	3,103.05	38,256.56	53,316.19	1,151,401.50	129,374.05
Warren	1,437,813.20	43,646.00	--	2,354.00	4,840.31	104,045.67	1,639,663.20	185,742.13
Washington	263,459.74	20,644.00	1,711.14	--	22,674.25	113,951.97	453,811.51	116,077.52
Wayne	1,003,181.53	51,949.00	--	2,076.74	20,462.44	160,371.76	1,231,731.40	197,416.94
White	1,405,582.56	78,489.00	--	4,086.27	40,239.58	93,994.74	1,649,826.91	304,167.70
Whiteside	4,607,807.71	104,525.00	6,077.50	8,357.73	80,007.09	330,574.07	5,171,918.02	411,775.68
Will	16,269,354.34	686,314.00	246,795.85	92,694.24	708,595.70	915,794.14	18,856,036.68	2,977,241.97
Williamson	4,490,254.82	240,527.80	108,539.70	83,512.28	16,629.74	166,806.24	5,073,954.27	871,234.26
Winnebago	20,167,333.00	529,086.09	284,060.08	72,983.32	667,185.57	489,544.27	23,283,226.62	1,638,241.16
Woodford	2,093,528.07	89,681.00	14,881.44	3,900.23	17,045.75	168,431.73	2,370,019.66	209,676.13
State	$701,497,164.38	$22,567,067.54	$9,960,453.62	$2,945,875.60	$36,342,914.04	$27,723,960.66	$821,058,888.01	$153,627,705.93

[a] Combination of State and Federal Aid.

[b] Regular Special Education and Vocational Education combined.

Data furnished by Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois.

APPENDIX F

AN ACT to establish certain rights of employees in public schools, to prohibit practices which are inimical to the welfare of public schools and to provide for the orderly resolution of disputes concerning conditions of service.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly:

Section 1. Short Title. This Act shall be known and may be cited as the "Public School Collective Bargaining Act."

Section 2. Declaration of Policy. It is the purpose of this Act to prescribe rights and duties of school boards and their employees and to establish procedures governing relationships between them which are tailored to fit the special requirements and needs of public education. The General Assembly finds and declares:

(a) School boards and their employees have an obligation to the public to ensure optimum performance by the educational institutions which they serve. In order to discharge this obligation both must exert their full and continuing efforts to achieve the highest possible educational standards. This requires establishment and maintenance of conditions of service which meet high standards and which will attract and keep a high quality employee.

(b) That the policy of the State is to recognize the rights of employees to form, join, or assist employees' organizations of their own choosing, to confer, consult, and negotiate with school boards over conditions of professional service through representatives of their own choosing, to engage in other activities for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, protecting, and improving conditions of service, and to establish procedures which will facilitate and encourage amicable settlement of disputes.

Section 3. Definitions. The terms used in this Act shall have the following meanings, except when the context otherwise requires:

(1) "Employee": All personnel employed in a school district, except central office professional staff and substitute teachers employed on a daily basis;

(2) "Employees' organization": Includes one or more organizations, agencies, committees, councils or groups of any kind in which employees participate, and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of conferring, discussing, and negotiating with school boards over conditions of service;

(3) "School board": Any school board as defined in Section 1-3 of "The School Code";

(4) "District superintendent": The superintendent of a school district;

(5) "Central office professional staff": Those professional employees who primarily perform the function of the office of district superintendent, assistant superintendent, associate superintendent, deputy superintendent, business manager, or other administrator in like positions.

(6) "Administrative or supervisory position": The position of any professional employee whose primary assignment includes the functions of employing or dismissing employees, or the effective recommendation of such action, except those positions covered under paragraph (5) of this Section;

(7) "Teacher": All professional employees except those in positions covered under paragraphs (5) and (6) of this Section;

(8) "Service personnel": Employees other than those designated in paragraphs (5), (6) and (7).

(9) "School district": Any school district organized for the purpose of operating schools as defined in Section 1-3 of "The School Code";

(10) "Conditions of service": Includes salaries, other employee benefits permitted by law, working conditions, procedures for processing complaints or grievances as authorized by law, and other terms and conditions of employment.

(11) "Bureau": The Bureau of School Employee Relations established by the State Board of Education created by Section 4 of this Act;

(12) "State Board": State Board of Education;

(13) "Commission": The Commission appointed by the State Board to supervise the Bureau as provided in Section 4 of this Act;

(14) "Representative": The employees' organization selected as sole and exclusive negotiating agent pursuant to Section 7 of this Act;

(15) "Appropriate negotiating unit": Any group of employees for which representative may be selected.

Section 4. Bureau of School Employee Relations.

(a) There is hereby created under the State Board the "Bureau of School Employee Relations" hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau," which shall be under the supervision of a Commission of three members who shall be appointed by the State Board of Education. The original members shall be appointed for one, two and three-year terms. Thereafter, members shall be appointed for three-year terms, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. Commission members shall be eligible for reappointment. The State Board shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the State Board upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy on the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission, and 2 members of the Commission shall, at all times, constitute a quorum.

(c) Members of the Commission shall, when performing Commission business, receive compensation at the rate of $75.00 per day, together with reimbursement for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses when performing Commission business away from their places of residence. The State Board shall appoint an executive director and shall employ such other full-time qualified persons as may be necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau and appropriated for by the General Assembly.

(d) The Commission shall have authority to make, amend and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of this Act and is expressly empowered and directed to prevent any person from engaging in conduct violative to any Sections of this Act. The Commission shall also have the authority and power to hold hearings, subpoena witnesses, administer oaths, and in connection therewith, to issue subpoena duces tecum, to require the production and examination of any governmental or other books or papers relating to any matter pending before it and to take other action as may be necessary to discharge its power and duties.

Section 5. Coverage and limitations.

(a) School boards and representatives have the obligation to meet and engage in collective bargaining.

(b) Collective bargaining is the performance of the mutual obligation of the school board and representative to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to salaries, wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached.

(c) School boards shall not be required to bargain over matters of inherent managerial policy, which shall include but not be limited to such areas of discretion or policy as the functions and programs of the public employer, standards of service, its overall budget, utilization of technology, the organizational structure and selection and direction of personnel. School boards,

however, shall be required to meet and discuss on policy matters affecting salaries, wages, hours and terms and conditions of employment, as well as the impact thereon upon request by the public employee representative.

(d) No agreement shall contain any provision in violation of, or be inconsistent with, any law of this State.

Section 6. Rights of employees.

(a) Employees shall have the right to form, join, or assist employees' organizations, of their own choosing, to negotiate with school boards or their duly authorized agents on conditions of service through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in other activities, individually or in concert, for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, protecting or improving conditions of service.

Section 7. Unfair practices.

(a) It shall be an unfair practice for members of the central office staff, persons in administrative or supervisory positions, or members of a school board, individually or collectively to:

(1) interfere with employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in this Act;

(2) encourage or discourage membership in any employees' organization by discrimination in regard to initial employment, tenure of employment or any other term or condition of employment;

(3) refuse to negotiate in good faith with the representatives of employees selected or designated pursuant to the provisions of Section 7 of this Act;

(4) refuse to execute a written contract, which shall be binding on both parties, incorporating the terms of the agreements reached during negotiations, if requested to do so;

(5) refuse to permit any employee organization: (i) to have access at reasonable time to areas in which those employees whom they represent or seek to represent work, or (ii) to use school bulletin boards, mailboxes or other communication media, subject to reasonable regulation, or (iii) to use school facilities at reasonable times when it does not interfere with the operation of the school for the purpose of meetings concerned with the exercise of the rights guaranteed by this Act;

(6) refuse to deduct from the salary of employees, upon receipt of an appropriate authorization form signed by the employee, the fees and dues required for membership in employees' organizations; provided, that such authorization shall not be revocable for a period of at least one year;

(7) issue or enter into individual employment contracts or agreements to members of the appropriate negotiating unit during the negotiations, mediation, or before agreement has been reached between the parties; provided, however, that school boards may issue individual contracts to, or make employment agreements with newly employed employees, and provided further that the said individual contracts or agreements shall be based on existing policies for the current year but shall be subject to change in policies reached in negotiations between the representative and school board.

(b) It shall be an unfair practice for an employees' organization, whether or not it is the representative of the negotiating unit, or an employee to:

(1) interfere with employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in this Act;

(2) cause or to attempt to cause members of the central office staff, persons in administrative or supervisory positions, or members of a school board, individually or collectively, to engage in conduct violative of the provisions of this Act; provided, that this paragraph shall not impair the right of an employees' organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein;

(3) refuse to negotiate in good faith with the school board;

(4) refuse to reduce a collective bargaining agreement to writing and to sign such agreement;

(5) violate any of the rules and regulations established by the Commission regulating the conduct of representation elections;

(6) refuse to comply with contractual agreement to arbitrate, or to refuse to comply with an arbitrator's award, except where such award is advisory;

(7) refuse or fail to represent fairly all members of the negotiating unit.

(c) The Commission is empowered to establish such rules and regulations necessary to (i) process charges of unfair practice; (ii) prevent any person from engaging in unfair practices; (iii) remedy any unfair practice. This power shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement.

Section 8. Representatives and negotiating units.

(a) The representative designated or selected for the purposes of negotiation by the majority of the employees in an appropriate negotiating unit shall be the exclusive representative of all the employees in such unit for such purpose and a school board shall not negotiate over matters covered by this Act with any other representative; nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent employees from presenting or making known their individual positions to a school board at its regular meetings, a district superintendent or other chief executive officer employed by a school board.

(b) Any employees' organization may file a request with a school board stating that a majority of the employees in an appropriate negotiating unit wish to be represented for the purpose of negotiation by such organization and asking

such school board to recognize it as the exclusive representative under Subsection (a) of this Section. Such request shall describe the grouping of jobs or positions which constitute the unit claimed to be appropriate and shall include a demonstration of majority support through verified membership lists. Notice of such request shall immediately be posted by the school board on a bulletin board at each school or other facility in which members of the unit claimed to be appropriate are employed.

Such request for recognition shall be granted by the school board unless:

(1) The school board has a good faith doubt as to the accuracy or validity of the evidence demonstrating majority support; or

(2) Another employees' organization files with the school board a competing claim of majority support within 10 calendar days after the posting of notice of the original request and submits as evidence of its claim of majority support verified membership lists demonstrating support of at least 30 per cent of the employees in the appropriate negotiating unit; or

(3) There is currently in effect a lawful written agreement negotiated by the school board and an appropriate employees' organization; or

(4) The school board has, within the previous 12 months, lawfully recognized an appropriate employees' organization other than the petitioner as the exclusive representative of any employees included in the unit described in the petition.

(c) A petition may be filed with the Bureau, in accordance with such rules and regulations as it may prescribe for such filings, asking it to investigate and decide the question of whether employees have selected or designated an exclusive representative under Subsection (a) of this Section, by

(1) A school board alleging that it has received a request for exclusive recognition from an employees' organization and has a good faith doubt as to the accuracy or validity of the claims made in such request; or

(2) By an employees' organization alleging that it has filed a request for recognition as exclusive representative with a school board and that such request has been denied.

(d) Upon receipt of such a petition the Bureau shall conduct such inquiries and investigations or hold such hearings as it shall deem necessary in order to decide the questions raised by the petition. The Bureau's determination may be based upon the evidence adduced in such inquiries, investigations, or hearings as it or its agent shall make or hold, or upon the results of a secret ballot election as it shall direct and conduct if deemed necessary; provided, that the Bureau shall dismiss, without, determining the questions raised therein, any petition filed pursuant to Subsection (d) (II) of this Section if:

(1) The petition is not supported by credible evidence that at least 30 per cent of the professional employees in the unit described are members of the organization seeking recognition; or

(2) There is currently in effect a lawful written agreement negotiated by such school board and an appropriate employees' organization, unless such agreement has been in effect for more than 3 years, or unless the expiration date of such agreement is less than 60 days after the filing of the request for recognition with the school board; or

(3) The school board has, within the previous 12 months, lawfully recognized an appropriate employees' organization other than the petitioner as the exclusive representative of any employees included in the unit described in the petition.

If the Bureau decided that it is necessary to direct and conduct a secret ballot election in order to resolve the questions raised by such petition, it shall order such election held, but in no event shall the name of employees' organization appear on such ballot unless it has submitted to the Bureau satisfactory evidence demonstrating that at least 30 per cent of the professional employees in the appropriate unit are members in good standing of such organization.

(e) In each case where the question of appropriate unit is in issue, the Bureau shall decide, on the basis of the community of interest between and among the employees of the school board, their wishes, or their established practices including, among other things, the extent to which such employees have joined an employees' organization, whether the unit appropriate shall consist of all employees, or separate units composed of some subdivision thereof.

Section 9. Resolution of impasse.

(a) School boards are hereby empowered to enter into written agreements with the representative setting forth procedures substantially the same as those set forth in this Section to be invoked in the event of an impasse in the course of negotiations. In the absence of such procedures, if the parties have failed to reach agreement after negotiations, either a school board of the representative may declare that an impasse has been reached between the parties, and may request the Bureau to appoint a mediator for the purpose of assisting them in reconciling their differences and resolving the controversy on terms which are mutually acceptable. If the Bureau determines that an impasse exists, it shall, within 7 days after the receipt of such request, appoint a staff mediator, employed by the Bureau for such purposes. The mediator shall meet with the parties or their representative, or both, forthwith, either jointly or separately and shall take such other steps as he may deem appropriate in order to persuade the parties to resolve their differences and effect a mutually acceptable agreement; provided, that the mediator shall not, without the consent of both parties, make findings of fact or recommend terms of settlement. The services of the mediator, including necessary expenses, shall be provided without cost to the parties.

(b) Nothing in this Section shall prohibit the utilization of other individuals or organizations such as the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service or the American Arbitration Association if the representative and the school board mutually agree to utilize such services.

Section 10. Disputes over the interpretation, application or violation of agreements.

(a) A school board and a representative who enter into an agreement covering conditions of service may include in such agreement grievance procedures to resolve such disputes as may arise involving the interpretation, application or violation of such agreement, or of the established policy or practice of such board of education affecting conditions of service.

(b) The parties may provide for binding arbitration of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of collective agreements.

(c) Where a party to such agreement is aggrieved by the failure, neglect or refusal of the other party to comply in the manner provided for in such agreement, such aggrieved party may file a complaint with the Bureau seeking an order directing that the party of the second part to proceed in the manner provided for in such agreement.

(d) Unless the award of an arbitrator is deficient for any of the reasons set forth in the "Uniform Arbitration Act", such an award shall be final and binding upon the parties and may be enforced under the aforesaid Act.

Section 11. Complaints regarding alleged unfair practices.

In the event of an alleged unfair practice as described in Section 6 of this Act, a complaint may be filed with the Bureau by any aggrieved party. The complaint shall state the specific unfair practice and shall include particulars to support the charge. The Bureau shall rule on the complaint within 20 days. Additional information or testimony by either party shall be provided upon request.

Section 12. Strikes.

(a) It shall be unlawful for any employee organization or employee to strike during the term of a written agreement.

(b) It shall further be unlawful for any employee organization or employee to engage in any strike after the expiration of any contract unless all procedures provided for in this Act have been utilized.

(c) No restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction shall be granted after exhaustion of all procedures of this Act, except on the basis of findings of fact made by a court after hearing prior to the issuance of such restraining order or injunction that:

(1) The commencement or continuance of the strike poses a clear and present danger to the public health or safety which in light of all relevant circumstances it is in the best public interest to prevent.

(2) The representative has failed to make a good faith effort to utilize the procedures provided in Section 8 of this Act for the resolution of impasse in negotiation:

Provided, that nothing contained in this Section shall prevent a court from enforcing any lawful provision of an agreement covering conditions of professional service.

Section 13. Costs of election, consultants or mediators. Costs of an election to determine the representative for employees as provided in Section 7 of this Act, shall be paid by the Bureau. Costs for consultants chosen by any party shall be paid by that party. The costs for a mediator, other than one provided by the Department shall be shared equally by the school board and the representative.

Section 14. Miscellaneous.

(a) Except as otherwise expressly provided herein this Act shall not operate so as to annul, modify, or preclude the renewal or continuation of any lawful agreement heretofore entered into between a board of education and an employees' organization covering conditions of service.

(b) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are modified or repealed as necessary to remove such inconsistency.

(c) Until such time as the State Board of Education becomes operative, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall carry out the State Board's responsibility under this Act.

Section 15. Judicial review of administrative decision. The provisions of the "Administrative Review Act", approved May 8, 1945, and all amendments and modifications thereof and the rules adopted pursuant thereto, shall apply to and govern a proceedings instituted for the judicial review of final administrative decisions of the Bureau of School Employee Relations. The term "administrative decision" is defined as in Section of said "Administrative Review Act".

Section 16. If any section, paragraph, sentence or clause of this Act is held invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the remaining portion of this Act, or any section or part thereof.

Section 17. This Act becomes effective January 1, 1974.

APPENDIX G

HISTORY OF THE BASIS OF THE GENERAL STATE AID FORMULA
FOR THE PAST 45 YEARS

Year Claim Filed	Flat Grants Elem.	Flat Grants High	Equalization Goals Elem.	Equalization Goals High	Qualifying Rates Elem.	Qualifying Rates High	Qualifying Rates Unit
1927	$ 9.00	$	$ 34.00	$	1.00%		1.00%
1935	11.00		41.00		1.00		1.00
1939	11.00		51.00	80.00	1.00	0.75%	1.50
1941	11.00		56.00	80.00	1.00	0.75	1.50
1943	13.00	2.00	62.00	85.00	1.00	0.75	1.50
1945	19.00[b]	4.00	80.00	90.00	0.25[a]	0.25[a]	0.375[a]
1946	25.00[b]	10.00	80.00	90.00	0.25	0.25	0.375
1947	22.00	7.00	90.00	100.00	0.25	0.25	0.375
1948	22.00	7.00	120.00	120.00	0.25	0.25	0.36
1949	22.00	7.00	160.00	160.00	0.40	0.40	0.50
1953	20.00	7.00	173.00	173.00	0.40	0.40	0.50
1955	22.00	7.00	200.00	200.00	0.50	0.50	0.62
1959	47.00	32.00	252.00	252.00	0.54	0.54	0.67
1961	47.00	32.00	252.00	252.00	0.54	0.54	0.67
1963	47.00	32.00	252.00	252.00	0.54	0.54	0.67
1965[c]	47.00	47.00	330.00	330.00	0.74	0.74	0.90
1967[d]	47.00	54.05	400.00	400.00	0.84	0.84	1.00
1969[e]	48.00	60.00	520.00	520.00	0.90	0.90	1.08
1970[f]	48.00	60.00	520.00	520.00	0.90	0.90	1.08
1971	48.00	60.00	520.00	520.00	0.90) 0.87)	0.90) 0.87)	1.08
1972[g]	48.00	60.00	520.00	520.00	0.90) 0.84)	0.90) 0.84)	1.08

[a] Full value assessment law enacted.

[b] Special emergency aid, $6 per pupil.

[c] ADA is weighted 1.15 in high school districts only.

[d] ADA is weighted for all high school students--1.25.

[e] H.S. ADA weighted 1.25; alternate method introduced; all claims increased 8%; size bonus for districts over 10,000.

[f] All claims increased 12%; size bonus--4%, 8%, 12% and 14%; 10,000-19,999; 20,000-29,999; 30,000-200,000 and over 200,000.

[g] All claims increased 19%; size bonus 4%, 8%, 12% and 16%.